Author: Sinyukov Boris Prokopievich

# The Lost Link of History

## Introduction

When, in my old age, I decided to finally find out how the “mysterious Russian soul” came to be, I had to study world history as much as possible. In the process of this study, I constantly found myself thinking two thoughts, one main and one derived from the main one. I will start with the secondary one:

1. Traditional history, based on traditional chronology, is written like a Russian matryoshka doll, collapsible, made to fit one inside the other: you remove the top one, and there is another matryoshka doll inside, and so on, almost to infinity, everything neat and tidy. When I became acquainted with the so-called new chronology, which I immediately agreed with, and the more I delved into it, the more I agreed with it, miracles suddenly began to happen with my “matryoshkas”. They stopped fitting into each other. They developed some kind of corners and protrusions that made it impossible to find a single pair that fit together. All the components of the amusing Russian matryoshka complex became independent of each other, like pebbles on a beach in Sochi.

2. I realised that the “cement” of history had collapsed, but chronology had nothing to do with it. History lost its internal cause-and-effect relationship, just like the matryoshka dolls. Traditional history teaches that history began in Mesopotamia and Egypt, and that the Bible was written by the Jews. Moreover, where these Jews came from is unknown. Nevertheless, there is no country where they have ever “not been persecuted”. And the main oddity is that history always mentions the Jews reluctantly, when it is impossible not to mention them, as briefly as possible, without going into details and without linking them to the general historical course. At first, it surprised me, but then it simply began to irritate me, just as an investigator is irritated by a potential criminal who has let something slip, completely clenching his jaw and pretending that the investigator simply misheard him.

The history based on the new chronology became even more distinctive in that it avoided mentioning Jews whenever possible, Nosovsky and Fomenko even agreed to “produce” the Jewish people, an undoubted ethnic group, purely from professional activity, like the Gypsies from Russian coachmen. But the Jews could not have acquired their well-known Semitic facial features from their profession, let alone from writing the Old Testament. And here I firmly decided that the activities of the Jews, the most ancient people on Earth, were being deliberately hushed up so as not to let anything slip out inadvertently.

Furthermore, Morozov and Postnikov timed the “writing” of the Old Testament to coincide with the eruption of Vesuvius, and Sodom and Gomorrah were “sent” there, and about the Jews - again, not a word. Or rather, a word, and that's all. And so began a complete mess, even more than that: they tried to remove the Jews from Arabia altogether, which I fundamentally disagree with, although I agree with the “neo-chronologists” that they have absolutely nothing to do in Palestine. Scholarly “Hebraists” read the “Islamic” Koran without a translator, but know nothing about the Jews. And “linguists” have even agreed to create an “Afro-Asiatic tree of languages”, a composite “branch” of which they designated as “Semitic-Hamitic”, and “created” another ten “branches”, all of which turned out to be “Semitic”, that is, Jewish. So there was no “tree” at all. And where the Jews came from is unknown. They dug up the smallest peoples who lived even before the Jews, like us in northern Russia, and described them by the day and hour for ten thousand years, but they still can't get to the homeland of the Jews. Something is not right here, I thought.

Another group of “linguists” invented the “Indo-European language group”, and it turned out that from India to Britain, including the Urals, Asia Minor, and the Caucasus, the language is practically the same, although there are only ten identical words in this large group of languages, at most twenty. And in the middle of all this space, halfway across the world, on the Arabian Peninsula, the Arabic language suddenly “appeared” out of nowhere, which has nothing to do with the “Indo-European family”. And the Hebrew Bible, which “appeared at the foot of Vesuvius”, is read by Arabs without a translator, but I have already mentioned this.

Linguists were joined by anthropologists, who immediately “proved” that yes, the “Indo-European race” has a lot in common, and that everyone has noses and eyes. But for some reason, they did not include Jews, or rather, they simply did not mention them, although there is no country in the “Indo-European” race where are no Jews, and there are even more of them there than, for example, Arabs. And that is also strange. Scientists in almost all fields of science do not want to talk about Jews, and that's it. It's as if they were “enchanted”. Solzhenitsyn seemed particularly interesting to me in this regard. Although he mentioned that Jews in Russia could have come from the Khazar Kaganate, his entire book “about the Jews” begins only with the annexation of Poland in 1772, saying that there were only ten of them in Russia before that. But I read Dal's Dictionary and found that almost a third of it consists of words derived from “goy” and “izgoi”. That is what the Jews, including the Khazars one, called us Russians, and with contempt. And they invented vodka for us. But I have a special article about this, and there is a section in the book “The Mysterious Russian Soul Against the Background of World Jewish History”. And note again, none of this is in the official history.

Let's take ancient trade. It's beyond comprehension. The most ancient trade began directly with spices, pepper and cloves. As if Europe could not live without them. What nonsense. But no, these spices were loaded onto camels and transported all the way from Yemen to England, or rather from India to Yemen by ship, and then by camels. I immediately thought that one camel a year with spices would be enough for all the European kings, but people still didn’t know what spices were, they needed to find some salt somewhere. Or the “Great Silk Road” from China to Europe. What, did all European peasants and craftsmen wear silk? They wore animal skins and homespun linen, with wooden clogs or bast shoes on their feet. And again, it turns out that one camel a year could bring enough silk for all the kings.

I think it is no coincidence that trade is portrayed in such an idiotic way, because it was the Jews, the “trading tribes’ from the desert plateau on the border between Yemen and Saudi Arabia, who were engaged in trade. That Yemen, which was not yet a neighbour of Oman, but occupied the entire southern coast of Arabia all the way to India. That's where they came from, my dears. But history is silent about this, and Jews are taboo. (Details can be found in the aforementioned book and articles).

As for writing, it's a complete mess. The Jews are mentioned again in passing, only in connection with the Bible, and the alphabetical writing system was sent to the city of Byblos in Phoenicia, although it actually originated among the Jews on the southern coast of Arabia for the convenience of trade. At that time, no one needed writing at all; they could barely speak, and in trade – that is the first thing you need. And what didn't they tell us. Babylonian cuneiform, Egyptian hieroglyphs, and God knows what else. Although all of this was the result of the Jews' successive tricks until they finally came up with the alphabet. (Details can be found there).

That's when I decided that since writing was only necessary for Jews for trade purposes, they began to record history along the way, changing it and rewriting it, as every new ruler in almost every country does to this day. To look good. Along the way, of course, a lot of nonsense and stupidity happened, and the Jews felt a little ashamed, although trade is not a very shameful business. And why advertise yourself? The “grey cardinals” always knew their worth, but they didn't shout about it from the rooftops.

On this basis, I decided to examine the new chronology of Morozov and Postnikov, or rather, their “interpretation” of history based on the new chronology. Will they continue to hide the fundamental role of Jews in world history? Postnikov is convenient for me in that he not only expresses his own thoughts, but also those of Morozov, which means less reading for me. And, of course, I mean that Postnikov would not have “interpreted” Morozov just for the sake of it, out of boredom. He needed to “correct” Morozov a little, but in such a way that we would not notice. Well, never mind, I'm not going to get into the finer details. I will only note whether Postnikov will hush up the activities of the Jews even more than Morozov himself, and especially Nosovsky and Fomenko, since he published his three volumes in their faces too (M.M. Postnikov. “A Critical Study of the Chronology of the Ancient World” in 3 volumes, “Kraft+Lean”, Moscow, 2000).

## 1. Before Jesus

### 1.1. Yahweh and the sea

When Yahweh freed the Jews from Egyptian slavery, he parted the Red Sea, and when he led them into Palestine, he first parted the waters of the Jordan and then closed them again. In other words, Yahweh drowned Israel's enemies in water. In general, the ancient Jews worshipped the water god Ridiya (Tzoma, 21a).

The following conclusions can be drawn here. Chermnoe means “red” in ancient Hebrew, and there can only be one Red Sea, and that is the one in which certain algae give the water its red colour at certain times of the year. In other places there are almost no such algae. This means that the Red Sea has a very ancient name, which has not changed since then. However, in my book, I have provided very compelling reasons to consider the black-skinned tribe of merchants from Yemen, who traded across the Red Sea and Ethiopia with Africa, and across the Strait of Hormuz with India, to be Jews. I also expressed a geological opinion that the Red Sea was formed recently, within human memory, and not millions of years ago. All this, as you can see, is confirmed by direct records of the Jews. Moreover, in modern Palestine, near Jerusalem, there are no seas except the Dead Sea. This means that such a stable cult of large volumes of water could not have arisen. And we have the god of water, Ridiya, like some Neptune or Poseidon, and continuous floods, not river floods. And there are no rivers in Palestine, only streams that dry up from time to time.

The authors of the post-Morozov new chronology identify the Bosphorus with the Jordan River. This is indirectly confirmed by the fact that during the Great Flood, the present Black Sea, when it was still connected to the Caspian, was a completely inland lake, separated from the Mediterranean by an isthmus, which turned into the Bosphorus as a result of the fall of a large catastrophic meteorite, simultaneously with the formation of the Atlantic Ocean and the destruction of Atlantis.. This is described in more detail in my book. And from Yemen to Jeddah and Mecca is a stone's throw away if you use the sea route along the eastern shore of the Red Sea along Asir, which strongly resembles Assyria. But one could also “identify” the Aden Strait, filled with a multitude of islands, with Jordan. That also fits well.

The Jews' worship of the water god Ridiya also shows that the trading tribe traded by sailing along the real Yemen to India and Africa. Not only that, but the “land” god Yahweh, drowning Israel's enemies in water, also adopted the habits of the sea god Ridiya.

These are small but still facts, and they say more about the homeland of the Jews in Yemen than in Palestine. Let's see how many more I can find. Well, at least the fact that there are several times more volcanoes in Yemen and Ethiopia than in Italy, including active ones (details in the book).

1.2. Ethiopians in Egypt

As I have already said, it is believed that the cradle of humanity is in Egypt, near the pyramids. The rule of the Ethiopians in Egypt is not widely known. I give the floor to M.M. Postnikov. (Vol. 1, pp. 215 – 217): "Having recounted the history of Cheops in great detail, Herodotus concludes it as follows: “This Cheops reigned, according to the Egyptians, for 50 years, and after his death, the throne was inherited by his brother Khafre. There is a comment on this phrase. It turns out that the priests deceived Herodotus. “Cheops (Khufu) reigned for only 24 years. He was succeeded by his brother Djedfrah, after whom Cheops' son Khafre ascended the throne”.

Herodotus: “So, until the time of King Rampsinit, the priests continued, Egypt achieved great prosperity under good laws. However, his successor, Cheops, plunged the country into disaster. First of all, he ordered all sanctuaries to be closed and prohibited sacrifices”. Comment: "Herodotus confuses the chronology of Egypt: Ramses II was a king of the 19th dynasty (1345 – 1200 BC), while Cheops was of the 4th dynasty (2600 – 2480 BC). This means that the priests (and not Herodotus) deceived their gullible listener by no less than 1,200 years! This is what, it turns out, is called “some inaccuracies” in the books of Herodotus. And these errors occur in a consistent, coherent narrative! But a 1200-year leap is nothing.

Herodotus: “To surpass the former Egyptian kings, Asichis erected a pyramid of **clay bricks** in memory of himself (emphasis is mine)... This is what this king accomplished. After him, according to the priests, a blind man from the city of Anisis, also named Anisis, reigned....” Comment: “Herodotus jumps here from the end of the Fourth Dynasty (c. 2480 BC) to the beginning of **Ethiopian rule in Egypt** (c. 715 BC)” (emphasis is mine). This means that the priests deceived Herodotus by 1,800 years.

Herodotus is confused not only in chronology. It turns out that the priests – Herodotus' informants – did not know their own kings: “Meneus was followed by 320 other kings, whose names the priests listed for me from their book. **For so many generations of people, there were Ethiopians among these kings** (emphasis is mine) and one Egyptian woman. All the others were men and Egyptians. This queen was called Nitocris, like the Babylonian queen”. Commentary: “Herodotus information about the Egyptian pharaohs before the era of the Ethiopian kings (715 – 663 BC) comes from two different legends (where is this known from? – Author). From the first legend were taken the stories about Nitocris (6th dynasty) and the kings of the 12th dynasty, Sesostris III and Moris (Amenemhet III). The second legend is the source of folk tales (? – Author) about Rampsinut (Ramses III) and the kings of the 4th Dynasty – Cheops, Chephren and Mycerinus. Herodotus' chronology of kings does not correspond to the royal chronology in the fragments of Manetho's royal lists”.

Herodotus: “So Sesostris marched across the mainland until he crossed from Asia to Europe and conquered the Scythians and Thracians”. Comment: “Herodotus confuses King Sesostris with King Psammetichus I...” Herodotus not only received false information from the priests (we would add: false,

according to traditional historians), but also recounts the events he saw with his own eyes with gross errors: “They (the Egyptians. – Author) use two types of writing: one is called sacred (hieratic), and the other is demotic (nationwide”). **But historians know better** (emphasis added by the author) what kind of writing was used in Herodotus' time. (It's just unclear where they got this information from). We read the commentary: “**Here Herodotus is inaccurate. In his time, the Egyptians used the most ancient hieroglyphic writing (for inscriptions), simplified hieroglyphic writing, hieroglyphic cursive (for business papers and letters)** (emphasis is mine) (by the way, there was no “paper” yet. – Author) and, finally, demotic writing” (for widespread use, from demos – people. – Mine).

Herodotus does not know geography: “One of Herodotus' most serious mistakes was his assumption that the Nile flows in the same direction as the Ister (Danube): “The Danube crosses Europe from west to east, the Nile flows parallel to the Ister” (P, 33): “**I suppose that the Nile has the same course as the Ister”. “The figures given by Herodotus do not correspond at all with the data on the size of the Black Sea known from ancient geographies**”. End of quote. Emphasis is mine.

The most interesting thing is that historians have no other sources about those times except Herodotus. I think that it was precisely because of Herodotus' phrase “for so many generations among these kings there were Ethiopians' that historians had to rewrite the entire history of Egypt, shuffling events back and forth over thousands of years, and the “Ethiopian rule in Egypt” itself was effectively “skipped’.

But Ethiopia, it turns out, is not only the one that is currently drawn on the map. In the Synodal translation of the Bible, there is no section on how Noah divided the land among his sons, but in The Tale of Bygone Years, there is: “Ham got the south: **Egypt, Ethiopia, neighbouring India, and another Ethiopia, from which flows the Ethiopian Red River, flowing eastward, ... and the Geon River, otherwise known as the Nile**” (emphasis was added by me). “Ethiopia, neighbouring India” is clearly modern-day Aden, which until recently was still considered a “continuation” of Yemen. If we take into account that lifeless Arabia was of no importance to the ancients, and only its coastline was important, then this very “neighbouring Ethiopia” can be identified with the entire Arabian Peninsula. But “Ethiopia, from which the Red River flows eastward” is not immediately apparent. But it is clearly not in Egypt, since “Egypt” and “the Nile” are separated in the “possessions of Ham” by the most extreme places. And the Nile without Egypt simply cannot exist, since Egypt is the banks of the Nile in those distant times, the rest being a lifeless desert on both sides. To find Egypt, one must find the Red River. The “Red” River may also be “yellow”, carrying a lot of sediment, since over thousands of years, the copyists and translators of the Bible cannot be held responsible for the accuracy of the names of colours. Such rivers are the Euphrates and Tigris, which flow, roughly speaking, from one mountain in Turkey. Then “the other Ethiopia” will be in Asia Minor, next to Ethiopia, “neighbouring India”.

But we still need to figure out Herodotus' “clarifications”. In those days, people were extremely economical with papyrus, parchment, and stone tablets, which were not paper after all. Therefore, no one would have written about “the other Ethiopia, from which the Ethiopian river flows”. Nor would they have written about “the river Geon, otherwise known as the Nile”. Let us add Herodotus' statement that “the Nile has the same course as the Istros”, and it may turn out that if Geona is parallel to the Istros, then “the other Ethiopia” is even closer to Asia Minor, the centre of Islam. And in general, the real Egyptians never called themselves Egyptians. And if Herodotus' interpreters “translate” his Black Sea (rus. – Chernoe) from the Chermnoe (in reality, the Red Sea), which I have encountered in literature, then it is understandable why it does not “match” in size. And we must also bear in mind that modern Ethiopia and Yemen used to

form one powerful state, even an ancient empire, Aksum (see my book), and the town of Aksum still exists in Ethiopia today, so it is not surprising that Ethiopia was simply “transferred” here at some historical stage.

Then it turns out that the modern Arab world, albeit without Islam, has existed since the creation of the world, and part of it was made up of Jews, who were also Arabs, but with their own “commercial” religion. And then there would be no need to say that “the Arabs conquered” anything, because they did not conquer anything. All of this has always been theirs. And if Morozov had not fixated on Vesuvius, but had looked at the Ethiopian-Yemeni map, he would have found even Assyria there, but with one “s”. It is probably possible to find other biblical places among the volcanoes active here.

The main thing to note is that in those days only Jews knew how to write, they needed it for trade, and they wrote all of history, but for some reason they did not want to describe how they infiltrated other peoples. Perhaps they did describe it, but then someone corrected it, so that now nothing can be understood. In this regard, I drew attention to Solzhenitsyn's last work, in which he calculated how many Jews, in percentage terms, can feed themselves among Russians. It turned out that no more than 5 percent, otherwise they would begin to have very tough internal competition, and they would be forced to “infiltrate” and expand further across the planet.

I almost forgot about Herodotus' "Egyptian clay bricks", which never existed in Egypt, but they were in Mesopotamia, along with clay tablets, because natural stone cannot be found in those places. And from modern Egypt, “Pharaoh Sesostris could not have conquered the Scythians and Thracians by moving from Asia to Europe”, as Herodotus insists. Before that, it was necessary to “move” from Africa to Asia.

1.3. “Bandit” inheritance

I thought that only the Russians before Dmitry Donskoy had a bandit inheritance, as I call it, from elder brother to younger, but not to son. I have researched the reasons for this in detail in my books and articles. Here, I will simply say that it is completely unthinkable to pass on the inheritance to a son who has not yet gained “authority” in the gang that “rules” the country and collects bribes and taxes from it for its own sustenance, especially considering that power was always won from rival gangs, not “passed on”.

Then I noticed that historians seem to be trying to hide this, obscuring the facts in every way possible, at least in the Roman Empire, which in reality never existed, that the next emperor, as a rule, is not only not the son of the previous emperor, but often not even a relative. Instead of an honest account of gang warfare, we are fed all sorts of nonsense, such as “elections” or “intrigues” of queens, “adoptions” and so on. But the fact remains and cannot be hidden. For example, the previous paragraph states: “He (Cheops) was succeeded by his brother Dedefra, after whom Cheops' son Khafre ascended the throne”. That is, he grew up, adapted, proved himself to be a bandit, but he could have chosen not to do so and remained unknown.

In M.M. Postnikov's Volume 2 I also read: "The example of Jehoahaz demonstrates the conventionality of the biblical concept of "son". He (Jehoahaz) was succeeded by his son Eliakim (renamed by "Pharaoh Necho" to Jehoiakim), who was 25 years old at the time of his accession (II Kings, XXIII, 36). The son turns out to be older than the father!" In Byzantium, which also did not exist, there was the city of Constantinople and that was all, the similar issues with succession occurred frequently.

Therefore, the "correct" inheritance of the throne began quite recently, almost before our very eyes. Even Putin will confirm this, the "named" son of Yeltsin, but in fact the younger "brother", not to say "bro".

What does this have to do with Jews, you may ask. Well, the Old Testament was written by them, and the sons are already older than their fathers.

1.4. Why, without reading, did they waste the clay tablets talentless?

From the previous paragraphs it seems that the Middle East and Arabia were largely transferred to present-day Egypt and all history was concentrated there, and in the East they left only myths about Mesopotamia, forgetting that there was some kind of life in Mecca and Medina, not to mention Yemen (from present-day Ethiopia to India).

Here is what M.M. Postnikov writes (Vol. 2): “At the beginning of the 20th century in the city of Umma (Mesopotamia) several tens of thousands of economic accounting tablets were found by Struve. Since Umma is not mentioned in the Bible (and since no enterprising enthusiast managed to identify this city with any biblical name), excavations in Umma were stopped, and the archive was wasted (even without research). In Paris, the tablets were sold to collectors for a franc each".

Note that in Egypt, each roadside stone with hieroglyphs is read about forty times, "interpreted", they strive, they correct each other, but there is nothing there except the inscription of who is buried there. And Mesopotamian tablets that tell about life itself (economic purpose) are sold for a franc apiece, without being read. And "economic purpose" is trade (receipts, price lists, contracts, bills of exchange), civil status (inheritance, bride ransoms, weddings, etc.), events of private life from which the life of folk can be reconstructed. I even think that they were read briefly and then thrown away, since the well-known history would have to be simply thrown in the trash. That is why they began to write utter nonsense about trade, like the "silk road" and the "transit of spices", instead of describing, for example, the transit of salt, without which life is not life. But they foolishly left in history that it was salt that was used to pay officials and soldiers of Byzantium and Rome for their service. But the main thing is that we still haven’t learned about those who invented trade, because all ethnic groups except the Jews are terribly embarrassed to trade, surrounding this process with all sorts of idiotic tricks so that it turns out not to be trade, but continuous gifts to each other.

About fifty pages later we read again from M.M. Postnikov: “Struve reports that “… in the northern part of the Phoenician coast they managed to find a whole treasury of clay tablets covered with a peculiar cuneiform alphabetic font… These texts should be interpreted with great caution”. This statement is truly intriguing: what are these “peculiar texts” that, like dynamite, should be handled “with great caution”? The thought involuntarily comes to mind that the information they contain is of a particularly explosive nature. Unfortunately, we were unable to familiarise ourselves with these texts in more detail. It is also noteworthy that the discovered “treasury” consists of texts written in cuneiform. If we consider that this is the only major find of texts in the territory of Phoenicia, then the validity of the widely held claim that the Phoenicians invented the alphabet becomes completely unclear. "In Phoenicia itself were found about a dozen inscriptions (alphabetic - mine), mostly very short".

I will begin my commentary by trying to explain the technology of cuneiform writing on clay tablets. These are not yet dry clay "pages", that are dried or fired after the signs have been applied to them. Try to draw something, for example, on plasticine, which is more flexible than any clay tablet, even with a very thin stick. You will get lines with jagged edges, unevenness and protrusions that will simply crumble during firing. You won't get a clear line. Therefore, in the tablet, you should not draw, but squeeze, pressing the sign inside it. Hieroglyphs can also be drawn by pressing their elements into the tablet. This is also evident

from Chinese and Japanese hieroglyphs. But the cuneiform script in the aforementioned tablets was already of an “alphabetical nature”. Now let me clarify that conveying speech through pictures is the same as inventing the wheel. Every child invents it, wanting to move something from its place, it turns out that rolling is easier. And the alphabet is an epiphany that not every nation is capable of. But only those who are in dire need of it, and in terms that cannot be conveyed with pictures, in trade terms. For example, “you to me, me to you”, “yours is mine”. Of course, this can be conveyed with a picture, but letters are better. Especially if you want to talk about qualitative characteristics.

Postnikov was unable to “get to know these texts better” because it was decided before him that the tablets were “as explosive as dynamite”. And why can they be explosive if not for history itself? That is why “great caution” must be exercised, only those “initiated into secrets” can read, and not just read, but read “as it should be”. It is better for all sorts of “amateurs” not to read at all. Of course, the Phoenicians were not the “inventors of the alphabet”, it had already been invented by the Jews, or rather, by a “trading tribe”.

Now about the “technology” of destroying historical traces. Postnikov (Vol. 3) about the Middle East: “While the decryption process moved slowly, the texts were available in staggering quantities from the very beginning. Excavations in the cities of Mesopotamia resulted only in the scientifically carried out destruction of what had remained undestroyed for thousands of years. (From me: they dug tirelessly, wrote nothing down about the place and conditions of the find, and then handed them over to museums and sold them, leaving no trace anywhere. There was no time to decipher them). The texts that have been lying in the museum's basements for more than 50 years can be tentatively dated based on the newspaper in which they were wrapped. This gives a plausible date for the "expedition" that found the texts, and hence the place from which they were extracted... The tablets were deciphered by everyone as best they could, almost never published together, the original and the "translation". For example, Sayce wrote a chapter for Wright's book "How to read Hittite Inscriptions" in 1884. Now it is believed that out of sixty signs, he read only six correctly! Nevertheless, it is believed that now cuneiform and hieroglyphs are **not deciphered, but read** (emphasized by me). Why the Hittites abandoned phonetic (roughly speaking, alphabetic - mine) cuneiform writing and switched to hieroglyphics, scientists have only unsatisfactory hypotheses. For example, a feature of Hittite hieroglyphics is that it was a script mainly for monumental inscriptions, while "not a single monumental or "public" inscription made in cuneiform has survived".

Note that the identification of the "biblical" Hittites with the Egyptian people "HT" (who, by the way, are often depicted as blond and not at all like the big-nosed Hittites from Bgazkei) and the inhabitants of Hattusas is based almost exclusively on the guesses (the ones just mentioned - mine) of Wright and Sayce. But, firstly, this almost directly indicates that Egypt was transferred to a new place. Secondly, that Egypt was always somewhere near the Jews.

Postnikov continues: "As inscriptions like the famous Behistun trilingua indicate, in the "ancient Persian" kingdom, along with a simple alphabetic system, the most complex Babylonian cuneiform was also used". I will add, it must be assumed that this "most complex cuneiform" is nothing more than alphabetic.

Postnikov has the information I need scattered throughout all three volumes. For example, Vol. 2: "The fact is that the Jewish written language originally had neither vowels nor symbols to replace them". "Professor T. P. Curtis says: "As long as the Jewish was a spoken language, it was written without any vowels or double letters". "It was formerly believed that vowel-marks were introduced into the Jewish text by Ezdra

in the fifth century B.C., that he was specially inspired by God for this work, so that he could not make a mistake. When, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Levitt and Capellus in France refuted this opinion and demonstrated that vowel-marks were introduced only by the Massorites, that is, according to orthodox chronology, more than a thousand years after Ezdra, this discovery created a great sensation throughout Protestant Europe".

But in Vol. 3 it is said: "… there was no particular linguistic difference between Byzantium and Egypt, since the official language of Byzantium until the 7th century was the Semitic language, close to (if not identical to) the language of the Bible. As for the Greek language, it was the language of the common people and opposition sects for a long time. It "came into force" only with the spread of the Gospels written in it". The "works" of the "philosophers", I note, were all written in Latin and then translated into Greek.

First, are there two languages in even one country today: for the common people, colloquial, and for the "elite" and clergy? No, and there cannot be such a thing, otherwise it would be impossible for them to live together. However, with one exception. Until very recently, the Jews always knew two languages, their home language, the Jewish, and the one among whose speakers they lived. When "combing through" the peoples, they could not do without it.

Secondly, the alphabetic writing was in their own, Jewish language, which does not exclude the use of hieroglyphic writing by the peoples they "combed". And among those peoples that they did not have time to "comb", for example the Japanese, hieroglyphic writing has remained to this day. The "combed" peoples understood, they were not complete fools, that alphabetic writing is better than hieroglyphic.

Thirdly, with vowels the water is mudded in order to confuse and complicate. The ancient Jews did not need vowels. Their language structure is such that vowel sounds of speech are easily implied when designating consonants, having only consonants, no Jew will make a mistake in the true pronunciation of a word. Therefore, they did not need vowel sounds in writing. But the other peoples did not have such a structure of language, vowels and consonants were combined in the most bizarre way, and not in a determined, that is, strictly regular way. That is why, having adopted writing from the Jews, they also tried to write with only consonant letters, and this has been proven. But they immediately got confused, and had to introduce the vowel sounds into their writing, though much later, already completely exhausted by the incomprehensibility of their own writing.

Fourthly, what could be the "linguistic difference between Egypt and Byzantium with its Semitic language" if "Egypt" was right behind the triple walls of the city of Byzantium, Byzantium or Constantinople - as you like? If Byzantium is nothing other than, as I proved in my book, a customs house on the Bosphorus, a "promised land" with territory within the city limits, built by Jews, who later called themselves Greeks, in order to collect duties for a reason, and live comfortably on these duties, without lifting a finger. All the work was to put a winch with a chain across the Bosphorus and turn it back and forth, letting through or stopping ships with salt from Elton and Baskunchak and timber from Russia heading to Europe.

And, fifthly, for example, it is now completely clear to me why nothing was heard about the Arabs for so many centuries, and then they suddenly fell out in terrifying numbers, like a jack-in-the-box. They were simply erased from history for several millennia, and it turned out that they did not exist in nature.

1.5. Dark night, "Egyptian"

Postnikov (Vol. 3) quotes from Ch. Loukotka: "The oldest writing known to us is Egyptian hieroglyphs. Some authors call hieroglyphs monumental writing, because they were used for inscriptions on the walls of temples, public buildings, on monuments, statues of gods, etc. The origin of hieroglyphs has not yet been established, but it is a finished form, a well-thought-out and fully developed system. But it begins to be phonetised. With the help of a system of images reminiscent of our rebuses, first of all, **pronouns** (highlighted by me, will be needed in the next section), prepositions, suffixes and other grammatical forms begin to be expressed. Further progress is syllabic writing. This is how the ancient Egyptian phonetic alphabet of 24 letters came into being".

Then Postnikov explains: "This logically impeccable scheme has one drawback: it is not supported by facts. For already by the end of the fourth millennium BC (6 thousand years from us) phonetic signs are already in use: the earliest hieroglyphic writing in its main features coincides with the writing written 5000 years later. Therefore, all the "stages of development" listed by Loukotka do not take place. Therefore, at present, some scientists (D. Diringer) believe that the hieroglyphic system arose during the unification of Egypt during the 1st dynasty immediately as a single whole by a person already familiar with writing. It turns out that the Egyptians did not use phonetic signs on their own, but used ideograms, almost always accompanying them with phonetic readings. Moreover, if an ideogram had several semantic meanings, then, in addition, a determinant was added to it. Moreover, a determinant was often added even when it was superfluous, that is, when the ideogram had only one meaning. Unable to explain this, Loukotka only states the "unsystematic use of determinants". In the same way, Loukotka does not explain why, given the availability of a phonetic alphabet, the Egyptians used ideograms (hieroglyphs - mine). The Soviet specialist Dyakonov explains this by the fact that without ideograms, a text written in one alphabet (which had signs only for consonants) was completely incomprehensible. **Why, however, did the authors of the biblical books, which were also originally written with only consonants, not use ideograms?**" (emphasis is mine).

Having asked this question, Postnikov did not answer it, but led us somewhere to the side. Therefore, I will continue to quote him in full, uncensored: "However, there is no need to think that there were many different hieroglyphic signs: "in total, scribes used 500 signs, but together with older versions and signs that had fallen out of use, their number reached 3000". To a European accustomed to alphabetical writing, such a number of signs may seem very large, but, for example, a Japanese will only smile indulgently at these numbers: the hieroglyphic minimum of the Japanese language contains 1820 signs, to read classical literature one must know another two to three thousand signs, and the total number of Japanese hieroglyphs, including obsolete and out-of-use signs, is estimated at several tens of thousands".

I will interrupt to count and figure it out. The "hieroglyphic minimum" of a modern Japanese person, who should at least understand a newspaper, is 1820 hieroglyphs. Then the ancient Egyptian with his 500 hieroglyphs, and 6000 years ago, should seem to us no less than an academician of linguistics, because he did not need many thousands of modern words, starting with broker, refrigerator and noosphere and ending with passionarity, voluntarism and empiriocriticism. And four to five thousand hieroglyphs of a modern Japanese for "reading classical literature" compared to three thousand of an ancient Egyptian is simply illiteracy. From this simple reasoning it is clear that the ancient Egyptians were almost modern Japanese - the legislators of many features of modern scientific and technological progress.

Having not received an answer to the question of why biblical scholars did not use hieroglyphs, I continue to quote, without omissions, although Postnikov does not mince words: "By the way, the **graphics of the Japanese language in many ways resemble the Egyptian** (Author`s emphasis). It also uses ideograms

and a phonetic alphabet (even two alphabets). Although any text can be written in a phonetic alphabet, the Japanese prefer to intersperse hieroglyphs into the text; they use purely phonetic writing only in special circumstances (when teaching children, in telegrams, etc.). Of course, tradition plays a large role here, but we must not forget that hieroglyphs significantly compress the text and allow you to understand at a glance what is being discussed. Purely aesthetic considerations are also of considerable importance: a letter in which some words are written in the alphabet and some in hieroglyphs looks more beautiful than a boringly monotonous sequence of alphabetic signs. Having used a hieroglyph which they consider rare, forgotten or obsolete, and therefore capable of creating difficulties for the reader, the Japanese, just like the Egyptians, ascribe its meaning with a phonetic alphabet next to the hieroglyphs".

I will interrupt again, because he will continue to explain to us for a long time what the Japanese do not ask him to explain at all. Firstly, the fundamental hieroglyphs should be approximately the same for all peoples, since a little man on paper, for example, should resemble a man, and a tree should resemble a tree. Secondly, the Japanese do not always "intersperse" the alphabet into hieroglyphs. They began to do this quite recently and quite purposefully, in order to move from archaic hieroglyphs to alphabetic writing, since scientific and technical progress with its abstract concepts, for the expression of each of which half a page of hieroglyphs is required instead of five to ten letters, or the creation of an infinity of new and new hieroglyphs. Thirdly, it is not without reason that this "parallel" writing is used "in teaching children". Fourthly, telegraph machines have not yet invented codes for transmitting all Japanese characters, including the surnames and names of the entire population of Japan, so they have been forced to use the alphabet in telegrams since the invention of the telegraph. Fifthly, hieroglyphs "significantly compressed the text" only in Ancient Egypt, but not in our time, in which dozens of new words appear every day, and for each of them, in view of their abstractness, it is necessary to use a bunch of hieroglyphs, or invent new ones. After all, the head also has a limit, like a computer disk. Therefore, no "aesthetic considerations" can help the matter, and no one has ever fallen asleep forever from a "boringly monotonous sequence of alphabetic signs", unless, of course, the book is interesting. Therefore, Plotnikov attracted the Japanese here for some other reason. Here's why: "Apparently, for similar reasons (tradition, compressed and quickly understandable text, aesthetic considerations), the Egyptians did not abandon hieroglyphs either".

But I immediately dismiss this reason on the basis of the above, especially since Plotnikov continues, crossing out what he himself has just said: "However, one feature of Egyptian hieroglyphics remains unclear: **why did the Egyptians consider it necessary to assign a phonetic value to almost every ideogram?** (Emphasised by me). The example of the Japanese language shows that, when applied to all hieroglyphs, this is obviously an excessive luxury, especially surprising for the expressive and clear Egyptian hieroglyphs. For some reason, the Egyptians allow a similar excess, as noted above, in relation to determinatives. It is believed that literacy in Egypt was the privilege of only a very narrow circle of priests and scribes. In fact, this opinion is not based on anything real. (…) We believe that **literacy was widespread** in Egypt during the time of hieroglyphs (Author`s emphasis). Otherwise, the practice of constructing monumental hieroglyphic inscriptions would be meaningless".

I'll interrupt to say: the Ivan the Great bell tower in the Kremlin was built in 1508, and in 1600 it was raised to a height of 81 meters. At that time, an inscription was written along the "hoop" of its tent, which is impossible to read from the walls of the Kremlin itself, even with your head raised, you have to go beyond the Kremlin walls. I don't think there were many literate people in Rus at that time, because even Tsar Vasily Shuisky (1606 - 1610) could not read. And for Egypt, you need to subtract at least another 5 thousand years,

if not all 7 thousand, to end up in the time that Postnikov tells us about with their "widespread literacy". I'll add, perhaps, that even today the Egyptians are not very "literate" in general. Have you forgotten who built the Aswan Dam, constructed power lines, and made tanks for them?

I return to Postnikov's text: "It is therefore possible to think that the **widespread use of identifiers and phonetic readings was intended to help semi-literate readers understand the text** (Author`s emphasis). "Literacy is widespread", I will add, but why the hell did they need double literacy right away? And then I immediately catch myself thinking: but even in the Soviet Union, all peoples, even their "illiterate" representatives, could read Russian, not just speak it. In any case, they did not make mistakes with money, or with passports, and understood the signs on Moscow stores. Although important papers published outside Russia were written, as in Egypt, at least the headings: in Russian plus their own "hieroglyphs". Moreover, it is somehow not very clear that "wide literacy" coexisted with "illiterate readers", of whom there were only a few, but for whom duplicate letter inscriptions were carved on the stones of "the walls of temples, public buildings, on monuments, statues of gods, etc".

Postnikov will beat around the bush for a long time, so I will report further in summary form: Unlike the Japanese, the Egyptians had alphabetic as their main method of "monumental inscriptions", while hieroglyphic, on the contrary, was auxiliary. In addition to this "monumental" writing in two forms, there was also "hieratic" writing and "demotic" writing. I will move on to them, also in a thesis: "there can be no doubt that hieratic writing preceded monumental hieroglyphic writing", since "in its structure, hieratic writing was alphabetic". Hieratic writing is not carving signs on walls and statues, but writing with a stick on papyrus, and it is intended to express sacred thoughts, for priests ("sacred" is what the author calls it). But papyrus should be used more economically than temple walls, so the number of letters and signs was not about thirty, but "about 600", and most of them became "widely used post-alphabetical abbreviations" intended to "save expensive papyrus". "The popular cursive form of demotic writing", that is, writing on papyrus, began to be called "demotic writing", also on papyrus, but was intended for the common people (demos – remember?). It was "even more laconic and fluent". This was how they thought before Postnikov.

Postnikov, however, thinks differently: "We believe that here (what I have outlined) everything is again turned upside down. It was demotic writing (as the easiest) that was the original writing of the Egyptian people. The other types of writing are artificial formations. (I will add in parentheses that then writing in general is as natural as a bird's cry). Hieratic (i.e. "sacred") writing is a stylized version of demotic writing, originally intended for magical "books of the dead", and hieroglyphic monumental writing was created, as we have already said, independently of hieratic for the needs of "visual propaganda". A detailed justification of this theory requires an inappropriate here in-depth study of subtleties ... "

And I will not "deepen the subtleties". I will simply set out his "theory" more clearly, as they say, "in simple terms". The common Egyptian people, as if they had nothing else to do, for example, like us somewhere in the provinces, created for themselves "as the easiest" demotic writing, note, alphabetic or something like that. And before that they invented papyrus, just for fun. After all, reeds on the street are not papyrus. Papyrus is more expensive than the stone walls of temples, as Postnikov just reported to us. There was nowhere and no reason for these simple people to write, it was easier to run to the next village, because there was no mail. And further than 50 kilometers, these simple people did not even know if there were people? Note also that the creation of alphabetic writing is the greatest discovery, a greater discovery than Einstein's theory, which today is fully understood by no more than a hundred people. And it is impossible to make this alphabetic writing, as they say, "en masse", because turning sounds into letters is

an insight, purer than monotheism. Available to a genius, even several generations of geniuses, tirelessly thinking about the same thing. But the people not only made their "demotic" writing, they all studied it, because "literacy was widespread", as Postnikov just reported to us. Although there was nothing and nowhere to write, and the people had only about three hundred words, after all, all this was 5-6 thousand years ago, don't forget.

In general, the people created letters and immediately forgot them as unnecessary, but for some reason they taught these letters without knowing why. But the priests, having learned about this, did not let them forget, and immediately applied them, having complicated them a little, making a “stylized version”, to “daze these same highly intelligent masses”. They wrote "sacred" books. But papyrus was expensive, and the common people had no money, and in general there was no money as such, why would they need it now in the tundra or in the Sahara? There are no stores there. And when geologists go there, they don't take money, but boxes of stewed meat and cereals. Just don't try to criticize me for geologists, I'm being sarcastic.

In general, the priests realized that their people don't read. Or they "stylized the version" of the letters so much that the common people didn't understand their "hieratic" writing, having gotten used to their "demotic" letters. Or because of the high cost of writing, but the priests had to think about it. After painful reflection, they came up with the following: the people don't understand their "hieratic", they themselves don't understand "demotic". Let's explain the "sacred" essence to the people with pictures, that is, hieroglyphs, carved on the stones of "public" buildings and statues of the pharaohs. And so that the priests themselves would not forget what they drew there, they also had to sign the pictures with letters, but which ones, hieratic or demotic? Postnikov does not give an answer, and how will I find out? Although, rather hieratic, if for themselves. And if for the people, then demotic would be necessary, but the priests did not know them already, forgot, having finished "stylizing". That is why Postnikov is silent, there is nothing to say on this issue.

So It turned out to be a complete flop, despite such grand ambitions. I will repeat them, not being proud.

1. Lowkotka does not explain why, given the availability of a phonetic alphabet, the Egyptians used ideograms? Dyakonov explains this by the fact that without ideograms, a text written in one alphabet (**which had signs only for consonants** - my emphasis) was completely incomprehensible. But Postnikov is not satisfied with this and declares:

2. Why, however, did not the authors of the biblical books, also originally written only with consonants, use ideograms?

3. Why did the Egyptians consider it necessary to assign a phonetic value to almost every ideogram?

Did Postnikov answer even one of these questions? I not only conscientiously rewrote his seventh paragraph, but also presented it “popularly”. I cannot shake the impression that Postnikov, like many authors who examine the deepest antiquity, desperately does not want to talk about the Jews in connection with this antiquity. Especially since “Egypt” was located right outside the walls of Byzantium, and the “Nile” river flowed in the same direction as the “Ister”. And they built here not from stone, but from "clay bricks". And on the outside of Byzantium they wrote in hieroglyphs, and on the inside they had to write in two languages at once, since not only Jews lived there. Jews managed the chain across the Bosphorus and the duties, and all the rest were servants, as they say now. It is not for nothing that they have it written in the

Talmud: "always use the services of slaves", and slaves are not necessarily the kind described by Giovagnoli in the book "Spartacus", but voluntary, for "salary" for "dirty work".

But why "the authors of the biblical books did not use ideograms, i.e. hieroglyphs, is also understandable. They wrote on the walls - for everyone, and history and ideology for "internal use" were written by Jews "in the quiet of their offices", for themselves. Let me remind you that my title is general - "Before Christ". And let me remind you that I have written in detail in my book what the "First Law" and Second Law are? And the confusion with the Yemeni-Ethiopian volcanoes, Vesuvius and Mount Zion is the result of a simple "multi-layeredness of events", when these "layers" were somewhat mixed up "during copying", and specifically - by the "scribes". And one more thing. "Why did the Egyptians consider it necessary to assign a phonetic value to almost every ideogram?" For the same reason why "toilet" and "boarding" at airports are always written in English and in the "local" language. These are also "monumental" inscriptions.

1. 6. "Liturgic" languages

The tale of "liturgical" languages is forgivable to Herodotus, given the age of his time and his comparatively low level of education, but even he did not write about such "specific" languages. They were invented by almost our contemporaries. And it must be said that this does not paint them in a good light. Such nonsense does not exist even today. Any sect, having separated from any religion, or created completely out of thin air, nevertheless does not invent a "liturgical" language for this, but uses the one in which more people understand them. And don't give me the example of Orthodoxy, which shouted "hallelujah" without understanding what it was. For it is a forced religion, taken out of laziness together with slogans in a foreign language. A striking example of this: "Glory to the CPSU!", "Workers of the world, unite!" and "The Party is the mind, honor and conscience of our era". Who among the people believed these slogans? Meanwhile, they hung from all the roofs. And their only merit is that they did not write "Proletarians" in German, the language of the original source of Marxism. Otherwise, today we would still be discussing the "liturgical" language of communism, although its beginnings were there, not linguistic, but ideological, the cliches of "newspeak".

M.M. Postnikov quotes the words of the poet and expert on languages Suleimenov. Here is what he writes: "William Joyce (1746 – 1794), having become acquainted with Sanskrit manuscripts, was able to write enthusiastic words that became the theoretical basis of comparative linguistics: "The Sanskrit language, whatever its antiquity, has a wonderful structure, more perfect than Greek, richer than Latin, and more beautiful than either of them, but bearing such a close relationship with these two languages, both in the roots of verbs and in the formats of grammar, that it could not have been generated by chance. The relationship is so strong that no philologist ... can help but believe that they all originated from one common source, **which may no longer exist**" (emphasis is mine). The direction of the emerging science (comparative linguistics - mine) was determined by this formula:

1) the similarity not only in the roots, but also in some forms of grammar cannot be the result of chance;

2) this is the kinship of languages that go back to one common source.

... Joyce's assumptions in the works of his followers developed into categorical statements. From the host of languages of the world, the Indo-European group of languages was finally singled out, which included all European (except Hungarian and Finnish), Iranian and Indian languages.

... A detailed comparison of the languages that turned out to be related (Suleimenov also includes the kinship of the Sumerian language with the Turkic languages here - mine), revealed a striking discrepancy in vocabulary. An explanation was found: it turns out that a language has a core - a basic vocabulary, and a shell - a vocabulary that can be completely replaced in the course of two millennia even in closely related languages. The unchangeable core fund included terms common to most "Indo-European" languages, which, according to mathematical linguistics, "usually make up no more than 1 - 2 percent of the entire vocabulary".

Comparing the languages of this family artificially created in the 19th century (referring to the Indo-European group. - Auth.), scientists saw how great the difference in dictionaries and grammar was, and concluded that the word is obsolete... A small group of words coincided in many languages. It was recognized as a remnant of the proto-Indo-European heritage and a doctrine was developed about the basic vocabulary stock, which is less susceptible to decay. And all those words that did not coincide fell into the category of vocabulary of ordinary words, the most mortal.

To what classes do lexemes belong that are common in Indo-European languages, that is, those included in the basic fund, that is, those that prove the genetic relationship of Indo-European languages. These are:

1) **Numerals** (highlighted by the author) **from three to five or up to nine**...

2) **Personal or attractive pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons**.

Why only the first two? Because in Indo-European languages the 3rd person pronouns do not coincide.

3) Some **kinship terms**.

4) Names of some **body parts**.

Thus, when comparing two outwardly dissimilar languages, it is enough to see the closeness of these lexical groups to declare the genetic relationship of the languages. The Indo-European family was created according to this simple scheme, at first, when the similarity of Sanskrit and Greek numerals, pronouns and kinship terms literally blinded European scientists. When there was only such an alternative - **either genetic kinship or none**. And the living history of languages knows several types of kinship. Linguists did not notice them and did not describe them...

...The question arises: maybe numerals, pronouns and kinship terms are not a remnant of the Proto-Indo-European language at all, but were simply borrowed from some one... language...

The Indo-Europeanists foresaw this question and prepared a "decree" according to which words of the basic fund are not borrowed. Consequently, numerals, a couple of pronouns and several kinship terms in all languages (Semitic, Turkic, Finno-Ugric, etc.) were born together with these languages and belong only to them and are not given to anyone, and are not borrowed from anyone. If at least Turkic were compared with Indo-European, this pillar would collapse without much noise" (end of quote from Suleimenov).

Postnikov himself agrees with Joyce about the non-randomness of "similarities in roots and grammar", but is against "the kinship of languages that go back to one common source". I will dwell on this "disagreement" of Postnikov in more detail a little later, since this "disagreement" also applies to Suleimenov, who a few lines above spoke about borrowing from one language. That is, Postnikov needed Suleimenov only because he interpreted Joyce well and clearly.

For now, I will follow Postnikov to Sanskrit, Latin and Hebrew. And I will not forget that he did not consider Greek, skipped over it on the way from Sanskrit to Latin. And I will not forget that he began to consider Hebrew last.

In general, Postnikov came up with the idea that Sanskrit, despite the Mahabharata and Ramayana, is not that ancient. At least, not older than Latin. And its kinship “with the main European languages is undeniable”. “Thus, according to Morozov’s theory, **Sanskrit is an artificial liturgical language that emerged in the 5th – 6th centuries on the basis of European languages brought to India by Christian missionaries**” (emphasis added).

Now, I hope, you understand why Postnikov disagrees with both Joyce and Suleimenov about the “origin” of almost all languages from one proto-language and insists that “Indo-European Sanskrit” “came from” a bunch of European languages. If I understood him correctly, then he would also consider Latin from the same position, as one of the primary sources of Sanskrit.

Indeed, all the so-called Romance, that is, Western European languages, originated from Latin, but not from classical, but from vulgar, "kitchen", colloquial, which is older than classical Latin. But Latin is not an Italian language, they have almost nothing in common, although we actually do not know how the same letters are read in classical Latin and the Vulgate, not a single witness remains - a speaker of this "dead" language. Maybe they were read in such a way that they would have turned out to be quite normal Italian words by sound. Postnikov already considers it a fact that Latin itself is one of the prototypes of Sanskrit, therefore it is only necessary to prove that Latin itself is the prototype of the Romance languages. Before Postnikov, "there was actually a gaping hole between Latin and the Romance languages”. Therefore, Postnikov sets himself a specific task: to eliminate this "gap" and "propose a new theory of the origin of Latin and the Romance languages”.

I will reproduce his "theory", of course, not as long as he did. We should not pay attention to the phonetic differences between Latin and Italian, since "we do not know the true pronunciation of Latin words". I have already said this. As for the morphological differences between them, which are very deep, since they are visible on paper, we should pay attention not to these crazy differences between Latin and Italian, but to the fact that "the forms of pronouns and verb conjugations of Latin and Romance are similar". Note, not between Latin and Italian, but between Latin and Romance. Perhaps that is why "Morozov believes" that "kitchen" Latin lived on its own together with the people, both spoken and written, and classical Latin "arose at the foot of Vesuvius" and was purely specialized - only "for priests and monks". But since the Roman Empire did exist, although not as large, namely the Catholic one, then “after its collapse, Latin survived as a common interstate language of worship”. It was improved and became classical Latin.

Note that immediately after these words, which conclude the “new theory of the origin of the Latin and Romance languages” promised a little higher, Postnikov calls it “only a roughly outlined scheme, in need of further development and detailing”. And this “theory” of his, which has become a “rough scheme”, “removes most of the difficulties and ambiguities”. It even “removes” the fact that “in such important sections of the basic vocabulary as numerals and personal pronouns, the Latin language is closer to Greek than to the Italian language”. Postnikov completely forgot to say how the Romance languages “came” from Latin.

Therefore, before moving on to Hebrew, I will say that this is complete nonsense. Postnikov starts talking about Hebrew as if we ourselves do not know that the Hebrew of the Bible must be distinguished from the

"Hebrew of modern Israel". Almost no one can read even Vladimir Dahl, not to mention the Tale of Bygone Years in Old Slavonic. Further: "Hebrew, like Latin and Sanskrit, is an artificial language of liturgical books, which has never been spoken". I immediately ask him whether people write and speak a lot in the artificial language Esperanto today? Ninety-five percent of the population does not even know that such a language exists. This artificial language Hebrew was created "in the south of Western Europe, where all the biblical events "take place", therefore it is "of Arabic-Spanish origin". "But Hebrew did not penetrate into the internal life of Jewish communities". In 1881, the Jew Ben-Yehuda began "to make Hebrew a living, spoken language". He did, actually, already in our days. Postnikov: "The revival of Hebrew was the only example in world history when a language that practically no one spoke became a living spoken language", and that "if it weren't for the response it received thanks to immigration from Russia".

Lord! How can paper tolerate this idiocy?

Calm down, I tell myself, be constructive, not angry. I calmed down and asked Postnikov: why didn't you make a section on the Greek language? Is it really that unworthy? After all, 70 percent of the population has never heard of Sanskrit, which cannot be said about the Greek language. I think that's why you "forgot" that you should have said at least a few words about the alphabet, since you started talking about writing, but instead you talked only about hieroglyphs and cuneiform. Or at least said something about a bull, a house, and a camel, since "aleph" is "bull" in Hebrew, or "a" as a letter. And in Greek - "alpha", also - "a", but without the concept of "bull". Just "a" - "alpha". And in Russian they have already "translated" - "az", that is, "I" in Old Slavonic. Cyril was not a fool, why would he use some kind of bull, it begins with "b", not "a". But the Latins did not invent a word, they simply said the letter "a", which speaks of the comparative youth of their alphabet, when it was no longer necessary to invent a word to remember the letter. And the Russians today do the same: а, б, в (a, b, c).

Let's move on to "house". House in ancient Hebrew is "bet", in Greek - beta, but not a house, but a letter, without, so to speak, clarity. In Old Russian it will be "buki", that is, "expected future", "uncertain future", or simply "future", what awaits us. Then everyone knew and used this word, not like today. The Latins again got by with just a letter, like we do today. Camel - gimmel - gamma. In Russian - verb, that is, to speak, talk, speech.

From this we can only draw one conclusion, that the "Greek" language is no different from Hebrew. The "Greeks" understand perfectly well what "aleph", "bet" and "gimmel" are, though somewhat modified, like Russian and, for example, Ukrainian words. Therefore, they do not need to give letters a name from their own language, like Russian. That is why, I think, Postnikov did not consider the Greek language, jumping in one fell swoop to Latin. But why did he need it? Moreover, in his "promising theory" he remembered the Hebrew language as some most insignificant phenomenon, like the influence of the weather on one of the days of the Roman Empire on its entire thousand-year history. And then he further humiliated the Hebrew language, the most ancient written language, with Ben-Yehuda's invention, which is not worth a damn. Why does he need this? I am at a loss, and besides the fact that Jews are very modest people, I can't find an answer.

Secondly, he awkwardly "criticized" the position that there can be no talk of "the emergence of a synthetic Sanskrit from one language that no longer exists", much less of the "Indo-European family of languages". And he piled up so much nonsense that the ears "wither".

Now we need to look at the phrase that Sanskrit is an artificial liturgical language that arose in the 5th – 6th centuries on the basis of European languages brought to India by Christian missionaries". I have already discussed the "artificial liturgical language" and will not return to it. I will draw your attention to the "base of European languages brought to India by Christian missionaries". Christian missionaries, also Catholic, appeared in Western Europe much later than Cosimo de Medici, who died in 1464. Was there no Sanskrit or Arabic before that? Moreover, they would have "brought" Latin there, not Greek, which is the only language read by Arabs. Yes, what can I say, Postnikov shamelessly turns history upside down and calls it his "theory", which "puts everything in its place", but he did not even bother to describe it. A brave man, without the "complexes" that decent people still have.

1.7. Traces in languages that can only be left by traders filtered through these languages

I will return to the "common lexemes that prove the genetic relationship of Indo-European languages". So, these are numerals from three to five or up to nine. Of course, I understand that even without traders, people knew how to count a little, but necessarily differently for everyone, because it would be sheer idiocy if all peoples from India to England had the same counting system, there is simply nowhere for it to come from if the peoples do not communicate. Conquerors also cannot transfer the counting system, because they must force them to change the counting system. And there are no such conquerors who would go from England to India. Now compare all this with the shyness to trade, which is present in almost all peoples except the Jews. I have examined the human qualities of professional traders in detail in a special article. Add to this that there cannot be more than 5 percent of traders among a non-trading tribe, otherwise they will compete and conflict, so they need to comb the nations, expanding like an explosion in all directions. Also remember, what are the first foreign words you learn when you go abroad? That's right, numerals, and "how much is it?". And now think, will traders learn many hundreds of words to denote numbers from one to nine, or will they unobtrusively force you to learn their own numerals? Especially since the traders themselves have to learn many names, and their customers have to learn a maximum of nine, but it is possible to learn only five. In those days, this was more than enough. As Marx used to say - one axe = three sheep. Or: frock coat = cow.

Second: personal or possessive pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person, that is, "I - you", "mine - yours". At the same time, the meticulous Postnikov specifically added: Why only the first two? Because in Indo-European languages, the third person pronouns do not coincide. And why should they coincide at the market? - I will ask. The third person is "he - his", "she - hers". They are absolutely inapplicable at the market. I gave the axe and said: yours, and the cow is mine. And the deal is in the bag. And the seller does not need to know at all that "she" will milk the cow. So there is no third person at the market, two are enough. But without knowing the first two persons, moreover, expressed in a uniform manner, it is absolutely impossible to trade. Just remember how Miklouho-Maclay traded in Polynesia.

Third. The names of some parts of the body at the market are not at all needed to say "give me your hand, distant comrade", or to gratefully exclaim: what a beautiful face you have, blue eyes and other compliments. Because all measurements and "weighings" were made with body parts. They weighed with a handful, measured with a "foot", that is, with a leg, or rather, with the length of a foot. After all, almost all measurements are based on human parameters: arshin, sazhen, oblique sazhen, vershok, and so on. And they are approximately the same for everyone, because the Paris Chamber of Weights and Measures did not yet exist, much less the "standard platinum-iridium meter". And all the ancient standards are always with you, and were remembered according to the same principle as numerals.

There are some kinship terms that are the same in all languages of the Indo-European group or family. It's a pity that they are not listed, I would have found a place for them in trade. Of course, there is no mother-in-law there, the kinship is too modern. But they often say "brother" at the market, which is why "bros" came about. This is to evoke the greatest trust, completely out of nowhere.

Note that I have examined the full list of "signs" that determine the attitude to the Indo-European family of languages. The remaining words can be completely different, but this does not affect the attitude of a given language to this very notorious family. This section is the greatest proof of the presence of the language of traders in all the peoples through which they seeped. And if in the Japanese language, for example, the same numerals turn out to be, then I take back my words. But they will not turn out to be.

And the last thing. I do not really believe that so many scientists who have devoted their entire lives to studying the "Indo-European family of languages" could not figure out what I wrote. Then there is only one thing left: scientists, and among them the majority of Jews are first-class literates, are very modest.

1.8. Scientists play with a children's "constructor"

This children's game is known to everyone, I will only remind you that you can assemble from it almost anything that comes to a child's mind. And not only - in a child's. Postnikov (Vol. 2): "The word "Babylon" (in Hebrew BBL) is translated as "Gates of the Lord" and as such can mean anything". For me, there is no doubt that this is Constantinople-Istanbul, Tsar-Grad and so on, that is, the world customs on the Bosphorus, first for salt, then for everything else, including Russian larch. And this is Moses' aim: the Promised Land, where life will be absolutely delightful.

Then Postnikov passes the floor to Morozov: "Gruden (a famous Hebraist and Bible researcher. – Auth.) gives Nebuchadnezzar the meaning of "Groans and tears of condemnation" or simply "Sorrow of judgment", but it is difficult to agree with this. In Hebrew we have: NBU – KDR – A – CR, and this, according to Steinberg, consists, as shown here, of three words, where the initial NBU is now read NEVO and denoted Mercury, the god who keeps records of events in heaven and on earth (Isaiah). But wouldn't it be better to admit that this is simply the word new (nuovo) or, even better, the abbreviated Navya (NBUA) – prophet… And the final word CR undoubtedly denotes the king in general, and Caesar in particular. These two words are indisputable. As for the middle word KDRA, or according to another transcription KDNA, Steinberg derives it from kadr - mighty, although in Hebrew KHDR means anxiety. But wouldn't it be better to assume that it was originally written KDR - dark-skinned, as the Hagarites-Ishmaelites are called in the Book of Genesis and in Isaiah. After all, the Arabic language itself is called LSHUN KDR by the rabbis. Then the word Nebuchadnezzar will mean the Hagarite new Caesar".

Postnikov adds on his own behalf: "In his analysis, Morozov mentions the interpretation of the word NBU as Mercury, the god who keeps records of events on earth and in heaven, or, more generally, as a soothsayer, a sorcerer, or, in general, a priest, a cleric. Accepting this interpretation for the NBU, and Steinberg's meaning of "mighty" for the KDR, and translating CR - king with the more general term "ruler", we will get as "Nebuchadnezzar" something like "Mighty Sacred Ruler" or better "Mighty Ruler-Priest".

I wanted to comment on all this, reminding the authors that the Jews do not have the vowels that they inserted. But the word "alarm", in my opinion, would be better suited, and then it would turn out, if we take into account that Adam was black: The Jewish guard post is the main one, or simply the main customs of the world. But I do not insist on this, God forbid, otherwise you will think that I also eager to play with a

children's construction set. Especially since I devoted quite a few pages to this game in my book and even quoted Dobrolyubov's words on the same subject, written in the century before last.

Here is the following quote from Postnikov, worthy of consideration on its merits. "The Syrian city of Damascus, characterized as the capital of a powerful and prosperous state, is mentioned no less than twenty times in the Old Testament. Thus, it turns out that the biblical "Syria" is in fact modern Syria. (…) The name of this city has two transcriptions in the Hebrew Bible, DMSHK, which can be translated as “bag of blood” (?!) or DRMSHK, which apparently means “city of dynastic rule”. Most likely, the second option is correct (although it is found only in the book of Paralipomenon, but it makes some sense, and the first is the result of a typo". “...the geographical position of modern Damascus is very poorly suited in ancient times for the capital of a strong independent state”.

I agree that Damascus is not suitable for the capital of a strong state in ancient times. The living conditions there were very unfavorable. The main thing is that there is nothing to govern from there, there are sands and heat all around, and there are few people. But we must not forget that Damascus is the capital of Damascus steel, the best in the world at that time, and even today this steel looks good. Despite Western technical progress. And history has preserved the "fantastic" technology of hardening Damascus steel: a saber heated to red heat is stuck into a slave and thus hardened in warm blood. Today, however, machine oil is used for this purpose, but not water. But there are no slaves either, maybe slave blood is better? Although, if we recall the author's dismissal of the idiotic translation “bag of blood”, it may well be that it was not living slaves who were used to temper Damascus blades, but animal blood collected in a wineskin. Otherwise, you can't get enough slaves, because they die when each blade is tempered. And only because of these unique blades Damascus could be famous. And scientists certainly want the capital of the kingdom, no less. They got used to playing with a children's construction set. Until old age.

1.9. Hebrew Bibles

M.M. Postnikov writes in Volume 2: "The strange fact of the absence of ancient Hebrew manuscripts of the Bible has long attracted the attention of specialists - religious scholars. Explanations were invented. "The fact that significantly **fewer** ancient Hebrew manuscripts of the Bible **have survived** than Greek ones is explained to a certain extent by the activities of the so-called Masoretes. All copies of the Old Testament, which in any way - in large or small - did not correspond to the Masoretic original, were strictly and categorically required to be burned in order to avoid severe punishment not only in the next world, but also in this one. It is not surprising that until recently there **was not a single known copy** of a non-Masoretic or pre-Masoretic Bible”.

This quote, together with the above-discussed name of the letters "aleph - bull - alpha" irrefutably proves that the "Greek" language is the Hebrew language, naturally, having gone through the stages of its development. And again I want to remind in this regard that what interest Postnikov and other scientists had in actually concealing this fact, or, in any case, not focusing our attention on it. All this works for only one thing, so that the world would not be too interested in where the Jews came from, and why they were eventually “persecuted” everywhere. But be that as it may, everyone knows that the Bible was written by Jews, there was no way to get away from it. The only way out is to show that it was too long ago, and then no one knows what happened, to create a fog, Babylon and Mesopotamia, to transfer Egypt, to send us all to Palestine, where there were no more Jews than in other places.

Therefore, the Qumran manuscripts were immediately found, and under very murky circumstances: “In 1902, the Englishman Nash acquired a fragment of a papyrus Jewish manuscript in Egypt”, I wonder from whom, the author adds. Then they “found” a whole bunch of the same papyri, called the Qumran manuscripts. "It seems quite significant”, the author adds, "that not one of the manuscripts found in Qumran contains a single fragment, much less a single complete work, that would belong to the New Testament”. And why, I will add, because the existing "Greek" copies of the Old Testament already contain enough of all sorts of things, for example, the Heavenly Virgin, which are completely unnecessary there. Then got tired of crawling around in the sands and inventing different stories that later turned out to be completely fabricated? "This idea - to find antiquities directly in European libraries, was supported by many enthusiasts”. One real fool, active as all fools, writes: "The manuscript is well preserved, it is very clearly executed and has not faded at all, so the text is easy to read”. The author adds: "This manuscript is 1700 years old”.

In my book, I have cited quite a few examples of forgeries of antiquities, “prehistory”, and very recent ones, taken from the works of Kalyuzhny, Valyansky, Nosovsky, and Fomenko. Therefore, from the work of M.M. Postnikov (Vol. 1) I will cite only the headings: "Church forgeries", "False genealogies", "Fantastic personalities", "Fakes of ancient authors", "Invented authors", "Fakes of modern times", "Falsifications in science", "Other falsifications". "Thus, we see that already in the time of Petrarch, "ancient" forgeries were widespread. Petrarch was a genuine mentor to Poggio Bracciolini, who, in turn, was his genuine student. Petrarch named many ancient names, his followers only had to "find" their works”. I will continue listing the section headings alone: "Archaeological falsifications: "Famous forgeries of modern times", "Falsifications of restoration", "Falsifications of scientists", "Crude forgery", "Fakes of the Renaissance", "Exposing fakes", "Inscriptions. Arbitrariness in reading inscriptions", "Numismatics", "Religious fakes". And two phrases of explanation: "The dating of coins in all cases is based on the traditional chronology of events and therefore has no independent significance”. "Some cuneiform texts are known only in drawings, there are not even photographs”.

1.10. Children's cube game "Monotheism"

In my book and the articles that develop its provisions, I expounded in detail the idea that the monotheism of the trading tribe of Jews arose from their necessary identification among themselves in a state scattered among other peoples. The monotheism of all other nations arose from above, when the rulers felt the charm of uniting their own and other nations on the basis of the ideology of monotheism. Therefore, the monotheism of the Jews is strong, and in all other nations it must be supported by all available methods, from persuasion to the fires of the Inquisition. Despite this, for example, Christianity was divided into numerous sects, while in the monotheism of the Jews all the sects were invented by historians, and by and large Judaism, based on Deuteronomy, has been monolithic for many centuries, because it is an objective need of its objectively disparate bearers. In this regard, I want to consider the views of Postnikov and others on monotheism, which seem to me to be child's play.

Postnikov (Vol. 2): “The concept of such a (single) God is striking in its complete absence (within the framework of traditional ideas) of roots and patterns, both in social structures and in natural phenomena”. “The traditional opinion, which claims that the monotheistic worship of Yahweh arose among the pastoral Jewish tribes, when there could not have been any social (and even more so, natural) foundations for monotheism, is completely perplexing”. That is true, I will note. But we must not forget that monotheism arose among them not during the times of “pastoral life”, but a little later, when, due to the unbearable

hardships of this very life in the desert, they figured out how to start trading among more prosperous tribes, where they were not allowed in for no reason at all.

"Within the framework of standard ideas", Postnikov continues, "there is actually no clear answer to this question (of monotheism - mine), which does not postulate the exclusivity and chosenness of the Jewish people". "Back in the middle of the 19th century, the founder of the so-called "true socialism" Hess put forward the thesis that the eternal merit of the Jewish people before humanity is the creation of a monotheistic religion. He is echoed by the modern American philosopher Dimont, who asserts that the entire European civilization is indebted to Judaism, since the latter is based on the "high and eternal principles" of monotheism. Opponents of Zionism, objecting to this concept, argue that the Jewish religion was originally polytheistic and that only gradually "under the conditions of a despotic slave state, the religious ideas of the ancient Jews undergo a slow process of transformation from polytheism to henotheism. But the main question is not whether Jewish monotheism is "eternal" or not, but whether it appeared as a result of external objective causes or was created by a purely mental effort, either by the will of God or due to the exclusivity of Judaism. **There is no answer to this question** (emphasis is mine), except for completely unsatisfactory references to the "despotic character" of ancient slave states. Thus, within the framework of standard historical ideas, we cannot escape the thesis of the exclusivity of the Jewish people, who managed to create a monotheistic concept without any external reason".

Further, Postnikov develops Morozov's idea about the origin of monotheism through the eruption of Vesuvius. "… some catastrophic eruption of Vesuvius occurred, which destroyed the temples of all cults on the slopes, except, perhaps, one of them; it toppled and smashed the statues of other gods. The only interpretation of such a terrible event in the eyes of believers could be that the god whose temple survived the catastrophe was the true god, and the volcano itself pointed to this temple as its own temple, and to the corresponding cult as its own cult. Thus, according to Morozov, the catastrophic destruction of numerous sanctuaries in the vicinity of Vesuvius and the Phlegraean Fields forced the surviving population to turn to the monotheistic cult of Vesuvius the Thunderer. In addition, and from our point of view, this is the main thing, **no other** (emphasis added) rational theory of the origin of monotheism exists".

However, on the previous page, Postnikov writes: "Although, it can be admitted that monotheism, once it appeared, would be quite acceptable for the ruling circles and theorizing theologians. And, as for the broad masses, they would quickly turn it back into a polytheistic religion, just as the Russian peasantry successfully combined faith in one god with the recognition of saints and such remnants of pagan beliefs as faith in wood and house spirits". And another paragraph above: "Of course, one can also take the point of view that the idea of a single and only God was developed as a result of a colossal, purely spiritual effort... This idea then quickly spread, since the tsars and emperors found this ideology very convenient for justifying their "divine" rights to the throne. **But this view is completely unacceptable as it contradicts the materialistic understanding of history** (emphasis is mine).

Three and a half pages later: "As cybernetics asserts, the activity and unity of a complex system is determined primarily by the intensive exchange of information within this system. What kind of exchange and with what intensity was possible with the then (Diocletian's empire) means of writing and transportation? It is enough to pose this question for the entire myth of the Roman Empire to fly to pieces".

I will add that under these very conditions, and even much earlier, Vesuvius frightened the surrounding area for 50 kilometers, the Thunderer was created - a single god who spread thousands of kilometers from

Vesuvius, about whom 99 percent of the population did not even know until universal secondary education two thousand years later.

Another quote: "The fact is that Arianism (roughly speaking, monotheism - mine) is, after all, a variety of Christianity, and the religion of Moses-Aaron (Judaism - mine) has nothing to do with Christ". That is, Postnikov hints that Christianity appeared first, and then Judaism. But he hints cautiously, latently preparing us for complete idiocy. Confirmation of this is in the following opus: "Let us note that this religion (supposedly dictated by God the Thunderer to Moses and Aaron, that is, Judaism) does not coincide with modern Judaism, if only because it does not yet have prophetic books, the astronomical embryos of which ... will appear only in a hundred to a hundred and fifty years".

So, it turns out that Postnikov says that modern Judaism is not the Judaism of Moses and Aaron. But this is complete nonsense, taken straight out of thin air. Everyone knows that Deuteronomy was and remains the foundation of Judaism. But Christians, instead of Deuteronomy (no moral commandments), actually use the "First Law", in which the moral commandments are put at the forefront, from which Moses was freed by Yahweh, having given him the new tablets of Deuteronomy. But no one knows this at all, since the "interpreters" tried to casuistically "rethink" the traces of this fact (details in the book).

Postnikov (Vol. 3) purposefully selects quotes, for example, Meiffy, directing us again to Egypt: "There is hardly a single great and fruitful idea in Judaism and the Christian religion, something analogous to which could not be found in the faith of the Egyptians. The manifestation of one god in the trinity; the incarnation of the deity, who is the mediator, from the virgin without the participation of the father; his struggle with the dark forces and his temporary defeat; his partial victory (since the enemy is not destroyed); his resurrection and the founding by him of an eternal kingdom, which he rules together with the righteous who have attained holiness; his distinction and at the same time identity with the uncreated, incomprehensible father, whose form is unknown, and who lives in temples not made by hands, - all these theological concepts permeate the most ancient religion of Egypt. In the same way, the contrast and even the obvious contradiction between our moral and theological views - the explanation of sin and guilt sometimes by moral weakness, sometimes by the intervention of evil spirits and similar ways, the explanation of righteousness sometimes by moral merit, sometimes by the help of good genii and angels; the immortality of the soul and the last judgment; purgatory, the torments of the condemned - we meet with all this in the texts describing Egyptian rites and in Egyptian moral treatises".

In all this I see only one goal, to eliminate as many Jews as possible as the founders of monotheism, since "they could not invent monotheism in their desert", and the attempt to admit this "contradicts the materialistic understanding of history".

I am especially disgusted by the cliché "materialistic understanding of history". After all, this is a verdict without evidence, without discussion, without competition of the parties. I am also disgusted by Postnikov's method, based on plucked quotes, almost without his own words. Like, it's not me and it's not my house, and to the question: who says this? the answer sounds: everyone says. In fact, he builds these quotes into a consistent "logic", although the whole structure is illogical. Let's check this, freeing the theses from the husk and presenting them in their pure form.

Postnikov says that there is no answer in the world to the question of whether monotheism appeared "as a result of external objective causes or was created by a purely mental effort". But there can be no such question, because it is completely idiotic, since everything that is created in the world is the result of a

symbiosis of needs and thoughts about how to provide for these needs. And the "external objective cause" can only be God, in whom Postnikov clearly does not believe, using the word with a lowercase letter. Further. Roughly speaking, monotheism according to Morozov and Postnikov was created by the eruption of Vesuvius or any other volcano. I have already spoken about this above, but here I will only ask: could it have created the Great Flood? And a meteorite the size of Madagascar? And a pole shift? That is, I want to say that the authors chose the first pebble they came across on the seashore and said: here is the alpha and omega! But this does not stand up to any criticism. But I would not dismiss the thesis that “the idea of a single and only God was developed as a result of a colossal, purely spiritual effort…” so casually, based only on a “materialistic understanding of history”. And Einstein, Bohr, Rutherford, Newton, and even the unknown Jewish author of the first letters to convey the sounds of speech developed their concepts as a result of a colossal mental effort, which was also a spiritual effort. Only this spiritual effort requires an impetus, a prerequisite, an irresistible desire or urge to learn. And such an impetus could undoubtedly have been the irresistible urge at that time to unite the people who had dispersed to trade into a single whole, even if they all lived alone in an alien environment.

That is why the first edition of the stone tablets of Moses contained moral commandments that confused the Jewish people. The people did not know what to do first, to love their neighbor or Yahweh? That is why Moses climbed Mount Zion again and brought Deuteronomy from Yahweh, which did not contain any moral commandments at all, not a single one. Yahweh was no longer interested in relationships between people, do what you want, and answer for your own actions before people. And every single commandment of Deuteronomy began to concern only the relationship of all Jews without exception with their Yahweh. Nothing else was required, only belonging to Yahweh, love for him and only everyday proof of this love through rituals, the strictness of which was above all else, above kinship, carnal love and "friendship of peoples". Self-identification with Yahweh allowed the Jews to self-identify among themselves, not allowing "outsiders" there. Isn't this a "colossal purely spiritual effort" of Moses? Moreover, Moses climbed Sinai for the second time, realizing that the first edition was “defective”.

Against the background of all that has been stated, how can one not consider Postnikov's postulates a children's game of cubes, assembled not even according to a picture, but anyhow?

1.11. The game of "broken telephone"

Children do not play this game now, in the age of computers. Therefore, I will explain. A line of children sits on a log or a bench and the leader whispers a word or a short phrase to the last one. From one to another, this word or phrase is also passed on in a whisper, into the ear, to the end of the line, then the last and the first "voice" it. And laughter ensues, since the phrase is greatly distorted along the way. For example, the first one heard "Katya loves Vova", and the last one - "The barren cat". And so on ten times, until you get tired of laughing.

Postnikov (Vol. 2) really wants, together with Morozov, for Arianism to arise on Vesuvius. Therefore, he perceives the following phrase from the Bible as in a "broken telephone". Firstly, he quotes this phrase not directly from the Bible, but somewhere from the middle of the "line", replacing some biblical words with "reversals", for example, Yahweh with the Thunderer. So: "The Thunderer, our God spoke to us in Horeb (Vesuvius. - Auth.), and said: your dwelling in this mountain is long enough! Turn ye, set out on your journey, and go to the mountain of the Amorites, and to all their neighbors to the plain, to the mountain, to the lowlands, and to the south side, and to the shores of the sea to the land of Canaan and to Lebanon,

even to the great river, the river Euphrates. Behold, I have given you this land; go, inherit the land ... "(Deut., 1.6-8).

Then he listens to the same phrase from the last one in the "line". This is how it looks step by step. "Morozov points out that in Hebrew the mountain of the Amorites is written as HREH-AMRI, Canaan as KNUN, Lebanon as LBNUN, and Euphrates as PRT". (Have you noticed that the "phone" has already screwed up, especially since vowels cannot be used?). "Morozov believes that AMRI is Umbria, KNUN is Genoa, LBNUN is Mont Blanc, and PRT is Danube". This is already very close to the end of the "broken telephone", since its end is here: "And we departed from Horeb and went through all this **great and terrible desert** (emphasis is mine), which you saw, on the way to HREH-AMRI (the Umbrian Mountains), as the Thunderer, our God, commanded, and they came to K DSH V-RNE" (Deut. 1:19). The first stage here is quite obvious (emphasis is mine): "The Great and Terrible Desert" is, of course, the Phlegraean Fields, **vast scorched spaces** filled with small volcanoes, fumaroles and lava beds (emphasis is mine). It is more difficult with the last toponym K DSH V-RNE…"

I also figured out the easiest and "quite obvious" question with the help of the Dictionary of Antiquity: "The Phlegraean Fields, a **fertile volcanic hilly area** (emphasis is mine) with many craters to the west of Naples".

Well, how can the "quite obvious" "great and terrible desert, scorched spaces" be a "fertile volcanic hilly area"? I did not even bother to figure out the "difficult toponym K DSH V-RNE", because it is a completely broken "phone".

Instead of playing "broken telephone", I would draw Postnikov's precious attention not to proper names, but to a purely geographical list: "mountain-plateau", where the Jews lived, and where they should go. Namely, to "other mountains", "to the plains", "to the low places", "to the southern edge", "to the shores of the sea", "to the great river", and even "to **all the neighbors**". Will you, Mr. Postnikov, find at least one landscape, geographical word-definition, where Yahweh did not direct the Jews? And if you tell me that he did not direct them to the tundra, taiga and jungle, then I will note to you that, firstly, such words did not yet exist, and, secondly, Yahweh's distinction between "plains" and "low places" could just as well designate the listed "tundra" ... And it is not at all for nothing that it is written - "to all the neighbors". This is precisely what shows that Yahweh directed them to disperse among the peoples and villages, and "not to gather more than three" in one place. And he also directly pointed out, go, they say, to the Bosphorus, the great river, for in those years the sea straits were not distinguished from the great rivers, especially since the Bosphorus has a strong current.

I would pay closer attention to the widespread use of the word "Samara" in the ancient world. Postnikov writes (Vol. 2): "The capital of the God-fighting kingdom is Samaria. It was founded by Amri. In Hebrew, Samaria is written SHMRUN and means "Watchtower". Therefore, this toponym should be translated as "Watchtower city" or "Watchtower fortress".

But in addition to the biblical Samaria, there is Samaria in Central Asia, and in general there are plenty of Samarias scattered around the world. But they cannot designate the capital as a watchtower city or fortress, unless the ancient Jews are fools. In ancient times, capitals were located closer to the center, and not on the border of the state, where they could be "watchtowers". This means that Samaria is not the capital of the God-fighting state, but its guarded outskirts. Or something guarded in general, for example, a road. For example, the same Constantinople with its three rows of walls and an iron chain across the strait.

I might not have taken up Samaria at all if I hadn’t needed to add another piece of evidence to my collection. Solzhenitsyn believes that the Jews "penetrated" Holy Rus in 1772, after the annexation of Poland, although there are vague hints about the Khazar times, but they are not given any importance. I, on the contrary, believe that the bulk of Jews settled here as princes and nobles back in the Khazar Khaganate, invented vodka, and with its help enslaved Rus. Details in my other works.

And then I came across biblical Samara. And I decided not to lose sight of it. Samara is the left tributary of the Volga where the Volga makes a huge loop around the Zhiguli Mountains, so much so that the beginning of the loop almost merges with its end. There is another river in Rus, the Samara, which flows down from the western spurs of the Donetsk Ridge and flows into the Dnieper at the easternmost point of its bed. Like the Volga Samara, it is also fed by snow and its flow almost dries up in the summer. The bed becomes almost dry. The Dnieper Samara at its source comes close to the Northern Donets, which flows into the Don, and up the Don you get right to the isthmus between the Don and the Volga, where they almost merge (the Volga-Don Canal). This, in my opinion, is the ancient route of salt from the Elton and Baskunchak lakes to Kievan Rus. And this river is a border (guard) river between the Black Sea steppe and the Russian forests. Wasn't it here that the Jews went to trade all the way to Madrid, as historians say? There are no highways here even today, and there is no railroad. But in ancient times it was possible to swim while there was water, and to carry or drag along a flat dry riverbed when the river dried up.

But that is not the main thing. Without the Jews, this "guard" name could not have reached Rus, only with the Jews. The rest of my collection of "ancient Jewish presence in Holy Rus'" is in other works.

1.12. Taking wishful thinking for reality

In my book I paid a lot of attention to polytheism, but I paid the closest attention to the so-called mother goddesses. As a result, I found out that, in fact, polytheism was monotheism, headed by a mother goddess, most often associated with a prolific pig. But almost every more or less numerous people, or rather even a union of closely related tribes, had their own name for this mother goddess, and all together it seemed like polytheism. Since the first means of communication and interaction appeared. Other goddesses, not mothers, were like family members in relation to the mother goddess, often squabbling among themselves, as in a real family. There were male gods too. For example, "daddy" Attis, aka "Egyptian" Osiris, whom the mother goddess herself nicknamed "daddy" in a diminutive way, since they decided to sleep in the same bed when "daddy" grew up.

In general, I devoted an entire chapter to the study of incest among these gods and goddesses, which was observed all the time and almost without exception. And in all cases, the male gods occupied an unenviable position, even worse than the old man with the old woman in the tale of the fisherman and the fish. Only later did the situation begin to level out a little, and then, the god Hephaestus forged himself there in his smithy, and his legal wife Gaia cheated on him with everyone who got in her way, and always with young men. In Yemen - Ethiopia the same thing happened, and the mother goddess was also a pig, which is why Jews to this day do not eat pork. Pork could be eaten once a year, as a great treat in honor of their goddess. And in Western Europe, this matriarchy began to end only with Cosimo de' Medici, when, having stolen a printing press from Gutenberg, he began to publish Malleus four times more often than the Bible.

Then, retroactively, both Jews and Christians rewrote not only history, but also all the Bibles that were available. And it turned out that matriarchy was a very long time ago, on the idiotic "edge of the early and

late Paleolithic", the Amazons are a myth, and the god Yahweh, not to mention God in general, is a man, despite the fact that the famous "thunderer" Zeus was recently a woman's bedding without the right to inherit. The Jews concealed their former goddesses more completely, even renaming Solomonia to Solomon. The Catholics did it worse, but it was not so long ago, and the awl sticks out of the bag here and there.

Now we can quote from M.M. Postnikov (Vol. 2): “Even the Mother of God can be found in the Old Testament. The book of Jeremiah, XII, V, 15-19, tells in detail about a certain cult of the “goddess of heaven”. However, the Hebrew original says malkat hassamajin, which means “queen of heaven”! However, most historians of religion believe (without any basis) that this is not about Mary, the mother of Christ, but about another, eastern Mother of God, Astarte. Isaiah also speaks of the “Virgin”, that is, even before the Gospels. To get out of the contradictions, historians have to create a whole novel”.

Mr. Postnikov, Astarte is not at all the "Eastern Mother of God" in your understanding of the mother of Christ, but a mother goddess, a fertile pig, who did not count her children and did not even give them names. This is simply a symbol of abundant childbearing. If you do not believe me, read Frazer. Or open my book. And the book of Jeremiah about the "goddess of heaven" is also about a symbol of female fertility. But the "virgin" of Isaiah already somewhat resembles the chaste Artemis, not only in incest, but even in a constant change of sexual partners not noticed. And in my book I traced this process of gradual acquisition of modesty by mother goddesses, from Gaia and Aphrodite to Artemis.

Now I have found confirmation of the polytheism of the Jews, which is the same as in Western Europe. The Prophets of the Old Testament are the most ancient Jewish books. Quote from Postnikov: “The use of two names of God in the Bible has long been noted by biblical scholars. Moreover, it has been found that, for example, from the Pentateuch one can isolate a coherent text in which the name AL (in another vocalization EL) is used in the plural (ELOIM). This text is called Elohistic. The use of the plural shows that remnants of polytheism have been preserved in it. The form AL is often used as AL-ALEIIM - “god of gods”. And the second part - in the plural ALE-IM - gods”.

So what? This only proves that at the dawn of their youth, until it occurred to them to trade, the Jews were the same as everyone else. But the phrase "god of gods" reminds me of "shah-in-shah", that is, also "shah of shahs", the title of which was held by the Shah of Iran Pahlavi, until he was kicked out of his homeland by the current "reformers of Islam". Actually, the Russian Tsar was kicked out in the same way. But, again, that's not the point. The point is that this brings Islam and Judaism even closer together than "understanding each other's writing without a translator".

1.13. Jews travel back and forth by sea

I already wrote that the Bible devotes a lot of space to the seas, and Jerusalem itself is in the desert. In the Dead Sea, not only is it impossible to swim, it is also impossible to drown. And no one swims in it, there's nowhere to swim. I started this article with this. To somehow move on to the time after Jesus, another quote from Postnikov (Vol. 2): “Orthodox theologian Weiss: “… the evangelist has no idea about the location. This is clear from the passage that is dedicated to the story of the two feedings of the people. Now Jesus rides back and forth across the sea, then he suddenly finds himself within the boundaries of Tyre and Sidon, and then – again to the east of the sea. Only a writer who has no idea about the topography of these areas can mix all this up. The evangelist’s topographical ideas are confused. He is not interested in these things at all. He cares neither about the place nor the time”.

The Jews began by descending from their Saudi plateau to coastal Yemen. They never parted with the seas and rivers again. They sailed in both directions, to the west and to the east. In the east they reached India, sailed to Iran, then walked a short distance to the Caspian Sea and then again by water all the way to the Russian city of Vladimir, which they themselves built. I mean stone buildings. We ourselves built wooden huts even before them. Along the Euphrates they reached Turkey, Damascus. The western tribes sailed to Ethiopia, it was not for nothing that Thor Heyerdahl made his papyrus boats from Ethiopian reed. Then they walked a short distance to the Nile. They sailed down the Nile to the Mediterranean Sea and again sailed east and west. In the east – to Constantinople, which did not yet exist. To the west to Gibraltar, and then to England itself under the guise of Roman conquerors. But they never fought with anyone, they only traded, traded and multiplied from the profits. How could they not write about water, rivers and seas every now and then? By the way, Scottish men still wear tartan skirts, which were in fashion among Yemeni traders of biblical times (Britannica).

Trade Secret of the Arabian Peninsula

Let me start with an intriguing question. How did it happen that one civilization developed on both sides of the Persian Gulf (Ancient East), another - along the Nile River (Ancient Egypt) and the eastern Mediterranean (Byzantium and Ancient Greece), and this happened at about the same time. And these two civilizations reached almost the same and very high level. In other words, the civilization seemed to embrace Arabia (Arabia) from both sides, and only along the sea coasts, the center was empty. Moreover, these two civilizations did not meet on the southern shores of the Black Sea, but they met only in the Caucasus, where, supposedly, the ancient Greeks sailed for the Golden Fleece.

In my book, “The Mysterious Russian Soul Against the Background of World Jewish History”, I hope to have proven that human civilization originated in Yemen and Ethiopia, from the time when they were not yet separated by the Red Sea, but formed a single whole (I also examined the process of the peninsula’s separation from Afro-Asia in the book). There, one tribe, living in difficult conditions on a high mountain plateau far from the sea, on the border with the desert, out of poverty, figured out how to trade with their more prosperous neighbors who lived on the seashore. Note that this tribe or tribes did not trade their own products, by no means, they simply resold, buying from some and selling to others. This tribe was called traders. They did not mix with the tribes with whom they traded, but established themselves among them with their own families and communities, maintaining constant contact with each other. Knowing from the ethnography of wild primitive tribes all over the planet that tribes living in abundance (I mean only food) developed poorly, I came to the conclusion that coastal tribes were more backward. Future traders, however, developed faster because they lived very poorly on the border with the desert, when in some years, especially unfavorable, they had to think painfully with their heads so as not to die.

How some primates turned into primitive people, and in such a way that both the primates themselves remained in existence, and people evolved from them and moved away, I considered in a special article “Why people do not “originate” from monkeys today”, in addition to the ideas that I expressed in the above-mentioned book. Therefore, here I begin with the fact that primitive people appeared precisely in Yemen-Ethiopia. And here we must divide these primitive people according to the degree of their perfection, not forgetting that both relics remain alive, and new mutants begin to flourish (see the aforementioned article), having completely distanced themselves from their ancestors. I also considered the question of the fact that not all people came from one species of primates, but from several of their species, which is why races appeared on Earth, and in one white race we should distinguish two races: blue-eyed

and brown-eyed. I will also note here that I immediately did not agree with either Darwin or Marx that labor made man man. Initially, it turned out to me that love made the proto-man the final man. I took this from Freud's article on wit, which is a very ancient feature of males, and I decided that during the period of matriarchy, the origins of which I also saw in the catastrophic shortage of women, wit was more necessary for males than even strength. Although Freud himself did not notice this, or did not want to notice it, being a Jewish researcher.

Then I discovered that the shortage of women, and therefore matriarchy, was not an absolutely global phenomenon. For example, in Australia, in the primeval forests of central Russia, in the North of Eurasia, matriarchy was basically absent. There, there was a partially separate life of male and female clans, meeting only for love by the river according to the old Russian song and dance: "And we sowed and sowed millet..., and we trampled and trampled millet...". Even the digestive tract of women in these parts is more adapted to vegetarian food (porridge) compared to men's (meat). So I had to move wit from the main reasons to a less significant second place, giving priority to trade, which is based on these very same, mentioned, trading tribes of Yemen and Ethiopia. Moreover, matriarchy existed only in the Mediterranean, Arabia, the Near and Middle East and in northern Africa. And then, I placed the core of matriarchy in Yemen-Ethiopia, where it was quickly overcome, since even the woman-queen Solomon was turned into a man (see the book). In Byzantium and all the other places I listed, matriarchy existed even when Yemenites-Ethiopians, who became Jews, arrived there with their patriarchy. Only Catholicism, led by Cosimo de' Medici, completely destroyed matriarchy (see the book).

By putting trade in first place in the transformation of ape into man, instead of labor and love, although not completely discounting them, I explained a lot to myself, especially since writing is not needed for anything other than trade. And alphabetic writing, as I proved in the book, cannot be invented many times, this brilliant insight can only mature in one head, and then - only be adjusted to a specific language and improved. Trade, in fact, the constant exchange with profit of what you do not produce, seemed to me the only way for a person to improve in the mental sense, inventing writing along the way, although I felt that between the banana-munching monkey and the peddler there is a very long way. It seemed that human speech itself originated precisely from trade, because without trade there is no need for speech, you can get by with the 60 sounds that the higher apes have for communication. At the same time, the trading tribe of Yemenis is a very ancient tribe, somewhere in the Paleolithic almost existed. Well, why would it need many words without trade, only to show natural needs and fear. For trade, 60 sounds are not enough. Moreover, in reality, all languages (not counting Malaysian and American Indians) belong to only one language family or group (Semito-Hamitic), which was idiotic called Afro-Asiatic. I dwelt on this in detail in my book. And there I proved that this Semitic-Hamitic "branch" does not exist, because Semitic comes from the Hebrew name Shem, and Hamitic comes from the name Ham, which is the same thing: the sons of Noah are brothers. In other words, all languages in the main composition of their words responsible for intertribal communication, and therefore trade, originated from only one language, the trading language, Semitic.

All this was going well for me, but I was still worried about the gap between the simple monkey and the "trade" monkey, the gap was so big, and there was nothing to put in the middle. The breakthrough in my mind happened when I watched a short film about monkeys in a nursery, who were constantly being observed. From this film I took away what I had long known, that monkeys are great inventors when it comes to inventing tools. I was not surprised that the wheel, which scientists consider almost the pinnacle of human genius, is invented by every three-year-old child. I set out this in detail in my book, expanding

these inventions to clay pottery, a spear, and a bow and arrow. This is not alphabet, almost any person who has fished can invent them. I was not even surprised that primates are capable of abstract thinking, and they casually demonstrate this to humans. That is what surprised me and enlightened my understanding. It turns out that higher primates do not know what it means to combine individual efforts into a common effort when one cannot cope alone. No matter how hard the scientists tried, they could not achieve spontaneous manifestation of this social quality from monkeys. The monkeys could not even guess to turn over a very heavy stone with a joint effort to get a treat from under it. Each one took turns approaching the stone and tried to turn it over one by one. But individually they showed miracles of ingenuity. For example, the individual through various trials (experiments) assessed the situation (made measurements by eye), then developed an idea (project), made a tool to implement this idea, then used this tool, and thus achieved the goal of the idea – obtained the treat. In this respect, the brain of a monkey works no worse than that of a foolish human being, and sometimes not very well at all.

Can you imagine: a monkey almost discovers the Pythagorean theorem all by itself, and every second one, and cannot think of suggesting to a friend with whom it fusses and plays from morning till night, that two or three of them turn over a stone that does not yield to its efforts alone? But we are used to considering them herd animals? And about herd animals, for example, ants and bees, we know that they are not only herd animals, but also social animals. They have a society, where each has a strictly established and even unchangeable place in the common cause of the survival of the species. Therefore, the concepts of herd and sociality are synonyms for us. And in general, so many dozens of derivative words have been derived from the word society, that is, community, that the original meaning of this word: let's do a common cause with joint efforts for the good of all of us, has somehow been lost. It turns out that this concept, so natural among people, is unknown to monkeys. But it is known even to wolves, driving a deer to its own comrades, and to many other land and sea carnivores, who act in exactly the same way during a group hunt. Therefore, I think that those primates who learned sociality, having overcome their amazing asociality, became people. Those who did not overcome this threshold remained monkeys. This, I think, can fill the missing link in the evolution of people, which I so lacked.

Absolutely, I'm not dismissing Porshnev's theory by any means, which almost no one supports, but only laughs at it, and according to which man descended from monkeys through cannibalism, eating relatives, especially their brain. Even scalping reminds us of this. Moreover, social cannibalism is a very social phenomenon, not individual, but originated from individual hunger and delicacy. Although I would like to add something on this subject from the latest research. But the digression will be brief. Stanley B. Prusiner won the Nobel Prize for his research on prions. Here is what Britannica writes about it: “A disease-causing agent that is responsible for a variety of fatal neurodegenerative diseases of animals and humans, the transmissible spongiform encephalopathies. Prion is an aberrant form of a normally harmless protein found in mammals and birds. The normal form of this protein, whose function is unknown, is located on the surface of brain cells. Only when this protein is in an aberrant configuration it causes proteinaceous disease. The pathogenic protein may enter the brain through infection, or it may result from a mutation in the gene that codes for the protein. Once in the brain, it multiplies, stimulating benign proteins to replicate themselves in the aberrant form. The mechanism by which the conformation is achieved is not fully understood, but it is possible that another protein, normally present in the body, may be involved in the process. Normal protein structure is thought to consist of many helices called alpha helices. In aberrant proteins, some of these helices convert into flat structures called beta. Normal protein is quite easily

degraded by cellular enzymes called proteases. But the irregular protein form is more resistant to this enzymatic activity. Thus, as prion proteins multiply, they are not broken down by proteases and accumulate in neurocytes, destroying them. The progressive destruction of neurocytes eventually leads to the formation of numerous cavities (voids) in the brain tissue; these cavities permeate the brain tissue, and it becomes like a sponge (spongiform encephalopathy). Diseases caused by prions include four types that affect humans: Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease, Gerstmann-Straussler-Scheinker disease, fatal insomnia, and kuru. Other prion diseases, such as scrapie, bovine spongiform encephalopathy (commonly called mad cow disease), and chronic wasting disease of mule deer and elk, are carried by animals. For decades, physicians believed that these diseases were transmitted by slow-acting viruses, so called because of the long incubation periods required for the disease to develop. These diseases were, and are sometimes still, considered slow contagious diseases. The pathogenic cause of these diseases has some viral characteristics, such as the small size of the agent, but other properties are unusual for viruses. In particular, the prions are resistant to ionization by ultraviolet radiation, which normally inactivates viruses by destroying their nucleic acid. Prions, unlike all other known disease-causing organisms, appear to lack nucleic or ribonucleic acid, the genetic material that all other life forms contain. Another unusual characteristic of prions is that they not only cause disease through infection, but may be responsible for hereditary and sporadic forms of the disease as well as Creutzfeldt – Jakob disease of all three varieties. The prion protein may act as an infectious agent, spreading the disease when it is transmitted to another organism, or it may result from an inherited mutation. Prion diseases also show a sporadic pattern of incidence, meaning that they appear at random in the population. The underlying molecular process that causes the aberrant protein to form in these sporadic cases remains to be elucidated. Researchers suspect that other neurodegenerative pathologies such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's may result from molecular mechanisms similar to prion diseases. The concept of an infectious particle that lacks nucleic acid is unprecedented in biology. Because of its unorthodox nature, the scientific community initially treated the prion theory with skepticism. Attempts to isolate the pathogen in its pure form have proven difficult, but in the early 1980s, American biochemist Stanley B. Prusiner and his colleagues isolated a "protein-like infectious particle”, the name "pree-on" was shortened to "prion”. Efforts to isolate the bound nucleic acid proved ineffective, and the prion model was accepted by science and became widespread. However, many questions remain about this unique particle”. (End of quote).

All of the above suggests that Porshnev's theory cannot be the cornerstone of the building that turns a monkey into a human. Although it is one of the particles in this complex, it is not the most important one. For example, in the ability of the body to receive in shock doses those elements that have a sudden effect on the growth of brain tissue. Having these building blocks, it is a matter of labor and practice to draw in the additional tissue those very "convolutions" that are known to be responsible for intellectual development. I have also written about this in other works.

I have to approach the main idea of this article at length, otherwise you will not understand anything. Here is another necessary digression.

The modern concept of the qualities of people suitable for trade are formulated in any book on business, but once they were available only to the Yemenite tribe of traders, the future Jews. I will list them: intelligence, sociability, choosing the necessary from the unnecessary, overcoming obstacles, competence. You see for yourself that there are only five of them, but this list is exhaustive, nothing to add or subtract, and all the rest, other qualities, will only be a special case of these five rules. But there is one more rule, it is

universal and applies not only to trade, it applies in general to the development of the animal species and even to reflexes, which from unconditional turn into conditional. This is a type of action, from stimulus to reaction to stimulus: one-stage, that is, "stimulus - reaction" and two-stage "stimulus - pause - reaction".

The last rule applies to all living things, so I'll start with it. Having pricked our hand on a rosehip or a rose, all animals, including us, automatically pull our paw or hand away, unconditionally. Having heard on TV about a fall in stocks, we run to sell them, and most of us do it without thinking, also automatically, unconditionally. But some of us, before running to sell, think a little, and only then either run to sell, or don't run to sell. Typically, those who pause come out ahead regardless. Because thinking won't take much time, unless you are a Danish prince, and it is better to take a taxi to the stock exchange than to run across the entire city in fear. And if you decide not to sell at all for now, having calculated that this is a temporary fall, then you will win many times over, buying more shares on the cheap. To make the one- and two-stage reaction to a stimulus even clearer, I will give a cat as an example. She always acts in two stages, not rushing at a mouse that appears in her field of vision, first she figures out, before giving herself away, will she have time to catch it? That is why cats are never hungry, despite the fact that mice act in one stage: they see it and run away. That is why a person who acts in one stage in trade will never become a successful trader. And whoever thinks, his brain is also improving, like the trained legs of a runner compared to the hypodynamic legs of a clerk.

Now, bearing in mind that we have mastered the two-stage reaction to a stimulus, it is high time to move on to considering the five trading rules. Reconnaissance. Once, a friend of mine in Soviet times, while on vacation by the sea, bought and brought to Siberia several dozen of these thin nylon nets for a woman's hair with all the money he had not drunk in time, which cost five times more in Siberia than by the sea. He came so proudly, saying, I'll get back all the money I've spent on drink. And what was his surprise and cruel resentment towards fate when not a single market trader would take these nets from him, even at his seaside purchase price. It turned out that almost all Siberian men, without exception, had bought and brought these nets with the money left over from vodka, and now they all didn't know what to do with them? That's what reconnaissance is. There are hundreds, thousands of examples, looking at this issue from both sides. Well, for example, imported installations for the production of ceramic tiles, which are now rusting idle all over Siberia. There has never been a shortage of ceramic tiles in our country, even crooked and slanted Soviet tiles, painted in a dark brown-crimson color, were bought up. The beginning of the 90s came, and some enterprises had dollars in their accounts. The "pathetic" directors bought imported chewing gum and immediately chewed it up with their entire team. The "forward-looking, hasty trading geniuses" bought, all at once, a tile-making unit. But they forgot about reconnaissance. First, they did not find out through their economic spies whether their currency-holding neighbors intended to buy such units. After all, tiles were on everyone's minds without exception. Second, they saved currency by not purchasing the technology itself along with the "hardware”. Third, they did not find out whether the clay around their enterprise was suitable for tile? After all, they knew that tiles were made from clay. And they considered this knowledge sufficient to start a business. Here you can list up to ten and even more. The main thing I have already said is that the machines are rusting, and the motors were dragged to houses to pump water from the well to the watering trough. And it turned out that the chewing gum lovers and their employees even came out on top, enjoyed themselves, and did not waste their money. If I tell you that reconnaissance is an extremely complex matter, but absolutely necessary not only for generals, but for all of us, even not

only for sellers, but also for simple buyers, then I am not discovering America with this. This was known before our era, though not to such modern subtleties.

Before moving on to the next rule of trade, I warn you that I do not consider these rules as an end in themselves (you will read about this in business books, perhaps even better written), but, so to speak, with a long-term view, namely, I want to find out how potential buyers treat these rules. I consider this to be the main thing. So, to the scouts, whom the people being scouted call spies, these same people treat very negatively, with contempt and apprehension. This applies even to primitive peoples who guard their fish, nut, fruit and other places in secret, and the scouts, that is, spies, try to find out about them. Here, not even dislike, but direct hatred is manifested. Now we can continue.

Sociability. Sociability can be traced in the books of classic writers about traveling salesmen, or, in today's terms, brokers, realtors and exclusive distributors. Without sociability, you won't sell anything, and you won't even be able to talk to a potential buyer; you'll be ashamed to pry into the soul of strangers. So that's enough about sociability itself. Let's talk about the perception of sociability by a potential buyer using a psychological example. Now, if your neighbor in the house or country house is a sociable person, that's good, isn't it? He's always happy to talk to you, but it's not so good when he doesn't let you say a word, but only says his own thing, which is not at all interesting to you. Now imagine a complete stranger who was passing by and pestered you with his conversations on any topic, not even related to trying to palm off something on you for your money. You won't just feel bad, you'll feel a little disgusted, if you also don't like his face or smell. Now imagine that with his face and smell, he offers you to buy a "very cheap" baby carriage from him, when your youngest son is already in the third grade. And he is persistent and patient until you are exhausted. And last Saturday you already bought a "cheap" electric meat grinder from the same scoundrel, which exploded, only he left the yard in a completely unknown direction and without leaving an address. As a summary, I will say that most people like the sociability of other people only to a very limited extent, and only if you yourself want to contact. But with such a size of sociability you will not sell anything, especially in ancient times. But for a merchant you need sociability that goes beyond all boundaries of importunity. Everyone knows how people perceive importunity. And do not forget that even annoying strange dogs are not liked. I returned to the ancient world, to the times of the Yemeni trading tribe.

Selecting the necessary from the unnecessary. This thesis applies to both goods and people. First about the goods. Let's say you do not need as many potatoes as you dug up in your village. And a buyer comes to you, who applies all his levels of contact to you, his two-stage reaction, coupled with the previously conducted reconnaissance. You will sell him potatoes almost for nothing, and when you go to the city to see your brother, you will find out that your potatoes and even worse than yours are sold here for ten times more. What mood will you be in at the market? What words will you use to describe your buyer in your heart? Moreover, you will also remember that your potato buyer sold you an "exclusive" hoe, made at a defense plant, therefore a little expensive, but almost automatic. And you practically did not receive money from him for the potatoes, almost all of the payment went towards the hoe. And at the brother's market there is mountains of these hoes, selling for a ruble a dozen, and they are made by a cooperative of "disabled" people who are sick in the head, not in other organs. However, you already guessed this at home. Let's move on to choosing people for purchases, I do not mean the hoe anymore. Let's say that almost all pensioners sit in front of the TV all day long and are shown almost non-stop "scams" of all kinds and brands. So, a seller, a professional seller of scam tickets, needs to choose from all the pensioners

passing by exactly those who look at a book (TV), to see nothing but a blur, as they say. And do you think that scammers often make mistakes? Not at all. Go to the market or stand for two hours in a busy place, you will certainly see a crying grandmother or grandfather who lost their entire miserable pension in a scam. This is what it means to choose the necessary among the unnecessary. And now ask those people who were considered necessary, are they happy that they became necessary? Yes, they, having been burned by milk, will blow on water from a well. That is, they will become unnecessary for traders, but you know that there were significantly fewer traders than buyers, even in ancient Yemen, so there will always be new, useful people. But this fact does not improve the general attitude towards traders at all.

Overcoming obstacles. This can be best demonstrated not in trade, but in art. Moreover, in the Soviet Union, where trade was in the hands of the state, and it was possible to profit from trade on a mass scale only if you spent the whole day at a vegetable base, in the dirt, with rotting fruits and vegetables. Therefore, the former Soviet tribe of traders switched to art, it is much cleaner there, and the money is almost the same, especially when the rulers decided to show it off on the world stage. So, about forty years ago I knew one hereditary 18-year-old trader, who played the button accordion a little. He entered the violin class of the Novosibirsk Conservatory six times a year, on the seventh try, when all the conservatory teachers knew him inside out, he was accepted. This is what overcoming obstacles is, unwavering. And I went into the mine for money, although, as one famous artist said, I showed promise in painting. The credits of films were full of specific names, on books - too, musicians, artists, museum curators - almost all former representatives of the trading tribe, only in the army and the police they were almost absent, filling this gap in the investigative, advocacy and prosecutorial activities. Institute professorships, "bread and butter", that is, military branches of knowledge in applied institutes, in "river bends" and so on belonged to them. And this despite the fiercest resistance of the authorities of the Union, pathological anti-Semites, preventing with all their considerable forces any higher education of Jews. This is what overcoming obstacles is. And notice, as soon as it became possible to trade in "free" Russia, will you find at least one more oligarch's name besides Potanin, which would not be specific? This is what overcoming obstacles is. In trade, they are also great, these obstacles, and Russians do not want and do not know how to overcome them, they do not even want to learn. And do you know the most ancient Jewish commandment, from the time of Moses? Every Jew, at all costs, must be literate. Period. This main commandment does not apply to Jewish women, therefore, Jews were the first to reject matriarchy, moving to patriarchy, all other nations - much later, almost yesterday, in the 16th century. But I seem to have imperceptibly moved on to the last trade commandment - competence.

You can't get a fish out of a pond without effort, say the Russians, but they do nothing to implement their own proverb. However, other nations do too. It is not for nothing that there is no country on Earth, excluding the recently discovered Australia, South America and some islands, where Jews have not been persecuted at various times. I will not list them, there are too many countries now, but I will reiterate that there are almost no countries where Jews have not been persecuted, at least at some time in ancient times. Why is that so? It does not happen just like that, for nothing. It is precisely for competence, competence in everything that concerns trade, first and foremost and since ancient times, but also in almost everything else. Let us recall at least that it was the Jews who created alphabetic writing, and no one else, I have proven this in my book and other works. Without writing, trade is impossible, and love notes and the chronology of kingdoms may not be expressed in writing. The first can be said in language, and the second is still rewritten by each new king, let him retell it better, there is less loss for historians. Remember Einstein,

Freud, the language will get tired of listing Jewish discoverers in any sciences. But competence is not the first reason for persecuting Jews, but an additional one, from resentment, from a feeling of inferiority from one's laziness against the background of Jewish hard mental labor, directed by the ability to overcome difficulties developed over hundreds of years.

How can I not cite here a saying from some fairy tale that I liked: "To defeat others is the valor of a beast, to defeat oneself is the valor of a man". And the Jews defeat themselves, tuning their body according to the Moses' commandments, overcoming the general dislike for themselves. And they are proud of this, calling themselves in their circle "the people chosen by God", chosen to rule over other nations. But they also rule in politics, and in art, and in trade, and in finance. In short: a great and unloved people.

Let's go back to ancient times, to the times when the Yemeni tribe of traders had just begun to develop resistance to contempt for their own benefit, outlined by me above, in the qualities of a trader. After all, none of the peoples through whom the Jews passed like a knife through warm butter accepted, developed similar qualities, or adopted the experience of trade. I mean any people as a whole, without exception, and not individual renegades from it. I mean any people completely, without a trace, and not individual renegades from it. On the contrary, the surrounding peoples behaved like snobs in relation to the Jews, despised, were deceived by the Jews, tolerated, but did it their own way, although, in general, they received their share of benefits from the development of trade. Let's take even the modern Kyrgyz. The overwhelming majority of this oldest and most backward people would rather die of hunger than sell anything professionally, even the results of their labor. They still sit in their mountains practically on grass like their sheep, have practically stopped developing, but are very proud that they will never stand behind the counter. I heard this with my own ears from many Kyrgyz people. In Kyrgyzstan, only Uzbeks are engaged in trade and they live better than the Kyrgyz. Let's look into even more ancient times, in which some peoples still live today. They have trade exchanges, a modern form of barter, but they use all sorts of tricks to avoid anyone thinking that they are trading. One leaves something in the bushes, as if he does not need it, but shyly expects that the other will take it, and leave something in return. It's funny to read about this shyness when trading, but it all happens in reality. I just don't have time to list the many rituals of this shyness when trading, but there are more than enough tricks to overcome shyness in trading, take my word for it. All this permeates the peoples of the globe, from the Eskimos in the north to the Australian aborigines in the south, from the Ainu in the east to the Indians in the Americas.

Or let's consider the so-called "gifts" and " counter-gifts", which are still most strongly held in the consciousness of the peoples of Central Asia, the Caucasus and the Arab world. Perhaps in other places, for example, in aboriginal Siberia, but I have read little on this issue. What kind of gift is it that requires a "counter-gift" to be given back, and something of approximately equal value? What kind of idiotic rule is it necessary to give a thing if you praised it? After all, you can praise someone`s wife too? Sometimes there is something to praise. And why do you need to "gift" at all? After all, you don't have to give back a flower given to a woman, with rare exceptions? Look, think about what the kalym itself is, if not a sale, arranged in an appropriately "shy" manner? You can give and give such examples when people are embarrassed by direct trade. Doesn't this shyness follow from the "rules of the merchant" that I have just considered? In my opinion, it does.

Let's move on to animals. There are probably few people who do not know about the natural shyness of animals. Let me remind you, without going into details. Dogs are very shy when they pee on the carpet. Cats and dogs try to bury their excrement, although recently they have only shyly indicated this action, without

actually doing it. "The cat knows whose meat it ate". An angry dog tied up in the street is very shy that its owner, who came out into the street, found it warming itself in its kennel, and, immediately jumping out of the kennel, begins to bark in shame at the whole wide world without any reason. Et cetera, as Pushkin wrote. Note that this is a primordial, so to speak, shyness. No one specifically taught them this shyness, it's shameful - and that's it.

Primitive people were also not taught the shame of trading, it's shameful - and that's it. But now we know that an integral part of the ability to trade is the above-mentioned "code of the merchant" who has overcome natural shame. Why did the Yemeni trading tribe overcome the shame of trading, that is the question. I have the answer to it too. It is enough to open the "Britannica" and other books about the ancient plateau in Arabia, located behind the coastal sea lowland of the southern Arabian Peninsula, flat as a table, and hot as a red-hot oven. That is where the tribe of Yemeni merchants has its roots. I will not dwell on the reasons and details (I have them), how this plateau, once more or less suitable for a meager life, became completely unsuitable for human life: lie down and die. But I believe that it was precisely this reason that directed the trading tribe, which was not yet trading at that time, to the coastal peoples. Having penetrated the coastal tribes, this tribe, which became a trading tribe, has now penetrated the entire world, lost its primitive and practically unfounded modesty in the struggle for its survival. And this was a unique phenomenon on Earth, different from all other national manifestations.

So that you finally understand when I will move closely to the mystery of the Arabian Peninsula, I must also tell you about my hypothesis, which is not fully disclosed in my book. It consists in the fact that the trading tribe or tribes, who later became the Jews, initially penetrated the coastal tribes of Yemen-Ethiopia and exclusively peacefully won the primacy there, engaged in an extremely profitable business - trade, which at that time looked like a simple, but very profitable exchange. For example, like the exchange of glass beads by Europeans for gold, diamonds, ivory, and so on of the natives of different continents and islands. At the same time, they had to teach all the tribes with whom they traded their words, without which they could not do in trade, then they invented hieroglyphs, all sorts of cuneiform in order to record debts and agree on prices, then one of the clever ones invented an alphabet. And all the tribes where they appeared, moving further and further from home, began to use this set of words, the vocabulary of which was constantly expanding and even absorbing local words.

The latest linguistic research shows that the core of the vocabulary of almost all nations consists of almost identical words. From this, linguists conclude that all nations, roughly speaking, originated from one people-tribe. At the same time, they completely ignore the data of anthropologists, who are running off their feet, discovering more and more new races and peoples that have practically nothing in common. This is where I see the folly of an overly rigid division of sciences. It is more useful, within certain limits, when solving certain issues, to consider all sciences at once, not to the point of absurdity, of course. In my opinion, two things are happening here at the same time. Firstly, roughly speaking, there are not that many sounds in the world, only seven. That is, any nation does not have a very large choice, including a more or less convenient combination of these sounds. Therefore, you will not get a great variety in the original words, the core of the language, no matter how hard you try. Yes, and there is no need to try, everything happens naturally, effort is already pretentiousness, at the first stage completely unnecessary. Secondly, and this is the main thing, carriers, exporters of sounds and terms, penetrating tribes. And this process becomes canonical after the invention of the alphabet, and by one people, traders. You can see for yourself, how rapidly our Russian language is changing, adapting to international concepts. The first to penetrate are

nouns, for example, джинс (jeans), which immediately receives the ending "ы" (-s) by analogy with pants, which are always used like scissors only in the plural. And we have no idea that the English ending "s" is already plural. We give it plurality twice, this time in our own way. After some time, the noun becomes the adjective "джинсовый" (denim), and from it - a new noun "джинсовка". In the computer world, this is especially noticeable, but not all readers are computer scientists (laugh louder at the computer scientist, by the way).

Naturally, this tribe first walked on their trade affairs, then took advantage of the knowledge of the sea fishing craft of the local tribes and switched some of them to pure freight for their needs, so far along the shores, from one tribe to another. Then their papyrus boats sailed across the narrowest place, where there are a lot of islands, the Persian Gulf and got to India. Then, when Aravia, also known as Arabia, began to sail away from Africa, they began to sail there, along the same route that they used to walk. There are also a whole bunch of islands there, so you can't make a mistake when sailing from one to another, and you don't need a compass.

I will note once again that, having acquired greater mental development due to the difficulties of their initial life, this tribe of traders, due to the difficulty but profitability of their profession, further improved their knowledge and skills. Almost the main, but not the first, acquisition of theirs was the ability to get close to other tribes without fighting and quarrelsomeness only on the basis of exchange, which seemed very profitable to the tribes they visited, while they did not even suspect how profitable it was for the newcomers-traders. Thus, quite recently, wild tribes were heartily happy with glass beads, and gave gold and diamonds for them. It is also natural that the homebodies tribes lagged far behind their "guests" («купцы» in Russian), and continued to lag behind, because their 50-60 words-sounds were enough for internal communication, while such literate people who had as many as 500 words in use, for example, seemed unattainable to them. The traders, having broken up into families, dissolved themselves in these families in the tribes they visited, but continued to maintain their way of life in the environment that dissolved them. Their very first invention was sociality, it helped them to be an indivisible whole and monolithic in the conditions of seeming dissolution. In other words, the society of the tribe of traders continued to exist in the conditions of territorial disunity of families and clans. The constant improvement of stone or clay tablets, or rather, what was written in them, allowed them to maintain and improve their society at a distance. And even rotation among the most diverse tribes, the study of their customs and morals, reflected in these tablets, exchanged in their society, allowed them to be more informed and more cunning, to guard the uniqueness of their society more closely.

It got to the point that every man born in this society was required to be literate, almost on par with the belief in their one god, Yahweh. In fact, it was created in order to preserve this society. And it was the most egoistic religion in the world, when everything was allowed, nothing was prohibited to achieve one's egoistic superiority, only disbelief in Yahweh was prohibited. Moreover, Yahweh himself did not interfere in any affairs of his tribe, he was needed only as a common idea, a banner, a unifying slogan, if you like, like "proletarians (merchants) of all countries, unite!" Naturally, all these families of merchants, separated by distance, but even more firmly united by this slogan of sociality, had more advantages and wealth, and therefore the opportunity and time to study, when other tribes could barely feed themselves during the time they were awake. Therefore, among the merchants, there arose disdain, contempt for the people of the land (Amkhaars), but at the same time it clearly provoked them to improve themselves, to study. Gradually, contempt gave rise to a direct call, which became entrenched as a dogma in Judaism: always use

the services of slaves. And modern Jews are scrambling to find words in the Talmud that should not be there, words that praise labor and equality. It became simply inconvenient to have such extreme and shameless egoism and glorify slavery in their ancient religion.

Almost no traces of matriarchy remained in this environment. Patriarchy tried to destroy these traces, transforming even the woman Solomea, Heda or whatever her name was, into King Solomon. And there was a pressing reason for this. The fact is that only men who were not burdened with children could engage in trade, because it is associated with a constant nomadic life. Men became the main providers of life's goods for the family and became very proud of it. Note that Judaism, in contrast to both Islam and Christianity, does not forbid pride in relation to everyone around, with the exception of the god Yahweh. In order to overcome the genetic predisposition of what is now a nation of merchants to respect a woman-mother, Judaism legally forbade worship of her. The Talmud attributes only negative qualities to women: laziness, envy, talkativeness, hysteria, and so on. "Everyone is happy at the birth of a son and sad if a daughter is born". According to the Talmud, a woman is her husband's slave: "Everything a man wants to do with his wife, he does - like meat from the slaughterhouse". "Teaching your daughter the Torah", the Talmud says, "is the same as raising her in debauchery". This is one side of the Talmud, educational, intended, as I said, to reduce the children's reverence for the mother, because the husband is constantly absent. The second side, protective, and it consists of the following. Prevention of fornication on her part, because, again, the husband is often absent from home on business. At the same time, the Talmud could not overcome the primacy of the woman in the birth of a child, and to this day the child is considered not the husband's heir of blood, but the wife's. We Russians find this funny, because our religion is borrowed, it borrowed almost everything, excluding female hereditary kinship, replacing it with male, more genetically related to us. But the Jews could not overcome their ancient roots, moreover, in Judaism it is not allowed to "edit" the Bible in its fundamental issues. I think that is why the Talmud forbids a woman to engage in public work, she must work only at home, only for her husband, and is intended only for the birth of children. She, like a slave, cannot appear in court, has no civil rights, has no right to education. She does not even have the right to get acquainted with the Bible. To refuse marriage for her is a crime and a sin. Therefore, in order to maintain fidelity to her husband, the wife must be a strictly preserved birthing machine for her husband, and nothing more.

I will note the peculiarity of the religious "value" of man and woman in Judaism and leave it without detailed consideration for now. I will move on to the expansion of trade and the education associated with it. The most ancient history tells of the ancient world trade route between India and Africa, which mainly passed along the coastline of Yemen. Even the first papyrus boats appeared not in Egypt, but here, and the reed for them was Ethiopian. Naturally, the commercial enterprise of the early Jews was carried out by sailing along the coast, capturing an ever-increasing part of the coastline. Initially, goods were transported and exchanged for other goods, those that were abundant "here" and in short supply "there". Debt, that is, credit clay tablets, receipts for goods, price lists appeared. Where there is a lot of fish, you need a lot of salt, since fish does not keep for long. In Yemen, there was native salt, but, naturally, not everywhere, but in a strictly defined place, which had been developed since ancient times, but in Ethiopia there was no salt, and the Ethiopians were forced to use potash instead. Therefore, everyone laughed at the Ethiopians - a historical fact. Historians now say that spices and incense were traded here, but I don't believe them. One papyrus boat could have brought enough of this stuff to last a long time for everyone who might need it, and I don't believe in the large consumption of these goods in those days, raw meat or fish would have been

enough to eat one's fill. Copper, gold and silver, which were also found in these parts, including India, are good goods, and their easy processing and wide applicability in life were quickly noticed. Therefore, it turned out that for a boat of salt one could bring only a piece of gold, copper or silver. So, along with clay bills, money appeared. When money appeared, they began to sail further, as they say, money is not a burden on the pocket.

Now we need to find out why it was necessary to sail further and further, why it was impossible to stay in one developed place? Firstly, there is no place in the ancient world from which the Jews were not expelled en masse. They were persecuted and expelled in the Ancient East, the Mediterranean, the Roman Empire, Egypt, Spain, Western Europe and even Russia. Why? Mainly because of envy of their well-being and ability to amass and save capital. Their ability to find a profitable business and prosper. Over time, the Jews even had to carefully hide their wealth, wearing a greasy lapserdak. At one time in the Middle Ages in Northern Italy, they were even forbidden to show their wealth, worn in the form of clothing, on clothing, and simply on the body. In the Middle Ages, even kings ordered them to feed and water their knights while they were idle, that is, without war. And all the same, the money given to the knights by the Jews for drinking, immediately returned to the Jews again, because all the production of things needed by the knights was under their control. Therefore, all the tribes that found themselves under their trade influence (I went to Yemen again) eventually realized that they were being fooled.

Secondly, the tribes that the trading families had infiltrated eventually accepted the ancient Jewish approach to business, some basic concepts about their written language and attitude to money, of course, not all of them, but the leadership of these tribes, and began to demand their share. Those who were intractable were expelled. It also happened that Jewish communities would seize power in some small country and suck all the juices out of it. Such ancient states were Aksum in today's Ethiopia, northern Sudan, western Yemen. And a number of other states in this region, sometimes expanding more than Aksum, sometimes narrowing to Ancient Eritrea. The entire southern coast of Aravia (Arabia) also now and then formed one state, then was divided into "pieces of sausage".

Thirdly, the tribal tree of the traders bore fruit greatly because of the good life. But not only for this reason. Early marriages among Jews, at 10-13 years old, were considered a general rule even 100 years ago. After all, there are now almost more Jews than Chinese, if you count them well around the world. And it all began from a narrow, almost lifeless strip of the Central Arabian Desert (plateau) on the border with the coastal lowland. This strip could not feed even several tens of thousands of people. Therefore, they could not do without territorial expansion. The experience of penetrating into foreign tribes was growing, the tool for this was constantly improving. However, they did not manage to penetrate into India, so far it was limited to border trade. The reason could be that the Indian tribes under the auspices of the rajas had already been structured and the Jews were simply not allowed deep into the country. But the space opened up along the Gulf of Oman to the Persian Gulf.

If you look at the map of the coastline of the eastern part of Arabia, starting from Yemen, it is not a short route, especially on papyrus boats. Therefore, it was impossible to circulate back and forth along it as today on an airplane. This route as a whole was covered in tens, and perhaps even in many hundreds of years. Because no one would have dared to sail so far at once. And there was no need. The introduction took place unnoticed, creeping, but tirelessly and purposefully. I will note that the Jews did not advance like the army of Alexander the Great consisting of only men, but as families, thoroughly, carefully. Exactly as the Chinese and Koreans are now settling our Far East and South-Eastern Siberia. Or as people from the Caucasus are

settling Moscow. But the Jewish settlers did not have such a powerful state as China behind them. Therefore, those traders who remained in their ancestral homeland, in Yemen, gradually assimilated with the indigenous population, leaving behind their trading rights and their ancient writing, and in some places – not leaving them, having completely dissolved. The vanguard of the most viable and rapidly reproducing individuals, moving forward and leaving their representatives with all their children and households on the lands “conquered” by trade, continued their expansion, no longer able to stop.

Gradually, the previously very significant connections between the vanguard and their ancestral home were broken. Clay letters came less and less often, and then they ceased to be understood at all in the ancestral homeland, so quickly changed the vocabulary, spelling and phonetics of the vanguard, constantly absorbing new data from the tribes into which they were being introduced. In addition, there was simply no one left to write, they had become so distant. Even within this long coastal chain of several thousand kilometers, connections were broken. The links of this chain began to poorly understand each other, assimilating and acquiring various features of the tribes that had sheltered them. And the vanguard continued to move forward, already along the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, to the Iranian plateau. Here reigned the ancient tribal kings, the shahs. Trade could depend only on them, so it was necessary to initiate these shahs into the mysteries of their knowledge and writing, to become their viziers, treasure keepers and simply teachers. The trading tribe itself began to stratify into viziers, bankers, teachers, musicians and simply teachers for the shahs. This also helped the Jews who remained traders. As you can see, the methodology of implementation was improved and updated along with the expansion itself, overcoming newly emerging difficulties.

This stage was the stage of the complex establishment of Jews on both sides of the Persian Gulf in the ruling elite of local illiterate kings, who had become very fond of science and art out of idleness. Naturally, all this new knowledge was spread only in the upper echelon; the common people had nothing to do with Jewish education. They remained just as downtrodden and enslaved, with their remarkable eastern patience and idolization of their masters. The Jews tried here too, because it was their system, dividing all people into slaves (Amkhaars) and their masters. Perhaps they themselves even introduced and aggravated this situation, which perhaps did not exist here before them. Only they, taught by several expulsions from tribes-states, came up with the idea that it would be necessary not only to trade, but also to infiltrate the ruling elite.

For some clans of this branch of ancient Jewish traders, the time had come to begin life in a completely infiltrated state. I want to say that there remained purely Jewish families of merchants, interspersed among the population of this kingdom, who also gradually assimilated, but much more slowly. But the viziers, bankers and teachers, close to the court of the shahs of various kinds and persuasions, assimilated much faster, marrying the native princesses, and therefore completely dissolving among the elite of society. After several generations, it was already difficult to recognize where the purely Jewish elite family was, and where the native one. The strict, mandatory obligation for Jewish men to receive an education was gradually transmitted to the entire elite and became a universal rule among high society. And everyone gradually forgot that it was the stray Jews who brought this rule to the country, and the former Jews were completely no longer considered Jews, they became an integral part of a seemingly homogeneous native society. Although, for example, algebra, al-jab is the science of aliens. Jews ceased to exist in the East as interspersed families. It is enough to recall our Russian noble society after Peter, especially the upper class,

which was half made up of people from Western Europe, but considered themselves Russians, only their surnames, exotic to the Russian ear, gave away the former aliens, such as Benckendorf and others like it.

I used to be very surprised by the fact that "Persian" and Jewish surnames and prefixes to surnames are the same. Such is "Ibn", which exists among Persians, Arabs, and Jews. So Ibn-Fadlan and Ibn-Dasta - "Persian" merchants on our Volga. Ibn-someone, forgotten by me, is the founder of some Jewish teaching. Even the Saudi Ben-Laden is a slightly modified "Ibn", and Ben-Gurion, the former Israeli prime minister, how is he different from the Saudi Ben-Laden? This refers to the consonance of surnames. There are dozens of such examples, either from ancient times or from today. Most likely, this prefix means something like "von" for Germans, that is, nobility, or an academic degree like the first literate, or belonging to the clergy. And if the latter is true, then Judaism and Islam are the older brother and younger sister, and Christianity is only the granddaughter.

Now we need to talk about religion. I won't touch on Christianity for now. I'll start right away with a quote from the "Atheist's Handbook" (Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1987): "One of the Talmudists, Rabbi Akiba, claimed that even if a man simply saw a woman more beautiful than his wife, he has the right to divorce her. The civil legislation of modern Israel is one of the most backward in the world. The Talmud's teachings about women have been elevated to law. Only a man has the right to decide on a divorce. If the husband refuses to divorce his wife, no court can dissolve the marriage". I'll continue from a newspaper article by Yevgeny Grigoriev from Kazan ("Trud" for 25.01.2001): "The wedding was held immediately, although the groom was married. It was necessary to resort to a saving Tatar custom: a man would go out to the square and publicly shout "tallah" three times, which translated into Russian means "I'm getting a divorce". After this simple procedure, he became single and could marry again.

Let me draw your attention to the fact that the institution of marriage is an ancient invention, and like nothing else, it characterizes not only the foundations of civil law, but also the very foundations of social life, and it does not change just like that, like introducing a new saint or angel into the consciousness of believers, changing the course of a religious rite, and so on. I will add that, having assigned a secondary role to women in their families, the Jews allowed themselves the luxury of having fun with non-Jewes, at the place, so to speak, of their permanent trading work while away from home. To this day, cheating on one's wife is not considered a great sin for a Jewish man, while cheating on a woman is a grave sin. But the same applies to a Muslim, if we do not pay attention to the completely fresh, so to speak, transformations in Islam. It is quite reasonable to assume in this regard that the ancient traders, having penetrated the aboriginal society of Central Asia and assimilated into its ruling elite, gave free rein to their preferences and completely legislated the possibility of having four wives for themselves, and then - a harem. I will recall more than once about the penetration of local aborigines into the ruling elite.

I will move on to monotheism. Both Judaism and Islam very strictly observe the principle of monotheism. "You shall have no other gods before me, do not bow down and do not serve other gods ...", - say the Jews. "There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is his prophet", - echo them the Muslims. It must be assumed that the traders came to the "pure environment" of the Middle East, where there was no distinct religion yet, only magic, which was easier to break due to the large number of its representative institutions and people who carried out its many forms.

To the fundamental dogmas of these two religions, which seem to me essentially one, I will add social relations between people, also among the most ancient. At the same time, I will not pay attention for now

to the later layers in Islam that ennobled it, such as love for one's neighbor and social justice. The Jewish treatise Niddah openly calls: "... always use the service of slaves". Modern Judaism, which has not rejected this treatise, does not use this rule in the literal sense of the word. Nevertheless, direct observations of today's life show that this thesis is alive today, and it is used to the fullest, within the law, of course, that is, for an unequal fee or love, artificially induced, such as love for the Motherland with a capital letter. In Muslim countries, the life of an ordinary person is also worth little, and the master is sacred in fact, so to speak. Just remember the numerous suicide bombers. You don't think that this is a pure impulse of reason or feeling, do you? It is unnatural. It is simply an artificial psychological attitude of a person from the outside, quite long-term and merciless to its future bearer. The same as artificially induced respect for a rich and powerful master. I want to say that in Muslim countries these two feelings, so clearly expressed, could not be born in the human soul spontaneously and from nothing. They had to be instilled for a long time and painfully, overcoming their natural rejection.

The tribe of traders, regularly driven out by the rulers of the nations among whom they had infiltrated because of envy, finally found a method that Berezovsky still uses. It is simple and foolproof. One must infiltrate the ruling elite by any means necessary and reform it in one's own image, while giving it, this elite, a portion of one's income or the means of obtaining it, in order to destroy the envy that is devouring the elite. Moreover, one must show in every possible way that one has given away all one's money and the means of obtaining it, while in fact trying to give away as little as possible. This method, well instilled, has borne fruit. Islam has begun to stride widely across the world and continues to do so at the same pace, and everyone has forgotten that Islam was originally only a slightly modernized Eastern Judaism, which, together with its bearers, gradually dissolved into Islam.

At first glance, this seems like a very bold conclusion, but let's think about it. It is well known that there was an ancient Babylon, where they began to build a tower of the same name, and the builders spoke the same language and did just fine without an interpreter. Because the builders wanted to reach God in heaven, God was offended and separated the builders by language. They stopped understanding each other, and the construction stopped before they had even reached half of it. Descendants searched for the first half for a long time, but never found it, and in confusion they assigned the name of the Tower of Babel to some ordinary little tower made of unbaked clay bricks that they came across. No one delved into the allegorical meaning of this biblical parable, people were too interested in the search for this tower itself. At that time, more than now, they believed the Bible, and literally. To me, this story reminds more of an attempt to create the first superpower, the remains of which, under different flags, stretch from the Atlantic in Africa to Indonesia, interrupted only by India. Three quarters of the earth's circumference along the equator. These are Muslim countries. And the same language for all the "tower builders" is not a spoken language as such, but a script, first in the form of hieroglyphs and cuneiform, and then in letters. And there was only one - the ancient traders, the Jews. This script was taken as a basis so that the whole world would begin to think the same way about the rules of life, and where they think the same, they act the same way and obey one, the one who owns this thought on the basis of private property. It is not for nothing that linguists, or linguists in Latin, racked their brains and piled up all sorts of nonsense about ancient languages and their luxurious tree of Semitic-Hamitic, or simply Jewish. You can read more about this in my book.

The idea about the superpower was right, but premature, communications were very bad. By the time you bring a clay tablet with the most important instructions on a papyrus boat, for example, from Yemen to Persia, there is already a different government and different letters, you will not understand anything. If

only they had been given the Internet, CNN, mobile satellite phones and supersonic passenger planes, then it would be a different matter. But they did not have all this at their disposal. The local rulers of both people and thoughts are ambitious people, and with poor communications, especially military ones, they begin to think too much about themselves. As soon as new instructions on the tablets did not arrive, and this happened all the time, the local governors began to itch about their literacy. Either the wedge was turned in the wrong direction, or a hieroglyph was corrected, in their opinion it looked very ugly, reminiscent of swearing. They had to correct it to their own liking. Some even got into the semantic essence of the tablets. In general, it turned out like at the bazaar: "Yesterday the crayfish were larger, but cheaper, today they are smaller, but more expensive". So the Muslims were divided into Shiites, Sunnis, and then into about a dozen and a half "branches". Then they invented borders, put their subjects to guard them, and they themselves - to go on campaigns, at first, of course, amateur, so, for nothing to do. So for these subjects, all the rulers had the same opinions, therefore the main backbone of the Muslim ideology of all the rulers petrified "for the benefit of the people", of course, figuratively, and not like a clay tablet. Of course, it is also true that in the part of the world in question, Judaism completely dissolved, merging with Islam, even in its homeland, in Yemen, where they completely stopped receiving clay letters from their former relatives, who disappeared in the trading expanse forever. In the article about monkeys, I substantiated my opinion that some kind of animal that gave the world mutant descendants, who later even learned to write and read, itself in its unchanged conditions, in the so-called environment, has not changed at all over the past thousands or millions of years. If you don't believe me, read it.

In order to finally move on to the description of the traders who sailed to Ethiopia along the Red Sea, which suddenly appeared out of nowhere, we must also consider the high level of cultural development in the Middle East, which, it seems, was ahead of even the West, for example, in medicine, arithmetic, algebra and astronomy. Jews who married Arab women, the Sultan's daughters, although they themselves were Arabs from Yemen, did not change their already genetic desire for literacy and knowledge, which was forcibly hammered into them by the Torah, the Bible or the Talmud, I don't even know for sure. The sweet and comfortable life, freed from the bustle of trade, could not but lead to a surge of knowledge and culture in high society. And this, like a contagious disease, spread throughout high society, where the fashion for upturned morocco boots was immediately replaced by a fashion for universal literacy. This is where such a high surge of Arab culture comes from, and not at all from Ancient Babylon, which, in general, did not exist. As for the reasons why the story of the Tower of Babel had to be made public so allegorically, I have nothing to say here. Perhaps censorship? Or the shyness of the author of the idea of a Muslim superpower, which died at the root?

In conclusion of this part of the story, I will tell you that Ibn Fadlan, who was the first to truthfully write about the ancient inhabitants of the middle reaches of the Volga, and whom I, due to my illiteracy, considered Arabs, like our Russian historians, were in fact not exactly Arabs, but Jewish traders, who came to us to buy young girls, and not some kind of hemp and bast (more details in my book). I deduced this from the fact that, having familiarized myself with history in more detail, I realized that the prefix "Ibn" is not necessarily Arabic, but rather and even more so - Jewish. There are plenty of Jews with such a prefix to their surname in historical literature. Rather, it is not even a prefix, but a doctorate. But, I think I have already written about this.

I will finally move on to the western branch of the Yemeni tribe of traders. Although, to be honest, I do not really like calling them Yemeni. In Yemen they only showed themselves for the first time as traders, and

they themselves, as I have already said, are from the plateau on the border of today's Yemen and Saudi Arabia. Therefore, they are more Saudi than Yemeni. Someday I will look at this question in more detail. So, when Yahweh freed the Jews from Egyptian slavery, he split the Red Sea, and when he brought them into Palestine, he first split the waters of the Jordan, and then closed them again. In other words, Yahweh drowned the enemies of Israel in water. And in general, the ancient Jews worshiped the god of water Ridia (Tsoma, 21a). Here we can draw the following conclusions:

1. Chermnoye (rus. – Чёрмное) means red in ancient Hebrew, and there can only be one Red Sea, and that is the one in which the water gets its red color from certain algae at a certain time of year. There are almost no such algae in other places. This means that the Red Sea has a very ancient name that has not changed since then. But in my book I gave very good reasons to consider the Jews to be a black tribe of traders from Yemen who traded through the Red Sea and Ethiopia with Africa, and through the Strait of Hormuz with India. And I put forward a geological argument that the Red Sea was formed recently, within human memory, and not millions of years ago. All this is confirmed by direct records of the Jews.

2. The authors of the post-Morozov new chronology identify the Bosphorus Strait with the Jordan River. This is indirectly confirmed by the fact that during the Great Flood, the present Black Sea, when it was still connected to the Caspian, was a completely inland lake, separated from the Mediterranean by an isthmus, which turned into the Bosphorus as a result of the fall of a large catastrophic meteorite, simultaneously with the formation of the Atlantic Ocean and the destruction of Atlantis. This is discussed in more detail in my book. This is also supported by the fact that the Black Sea is actually a dead sea from a depth of 200 meters. And if the largest rivers Don, Danube, Dnieper and hundreds of small rivers of the Caucasus and Turkey did not flow into it, it would resemble the Dead Sea in Arabia.

3. The worship of the Jews to the water god Ridia also shows that the trading tribe traded, sailing along the present Yemen to India and Africa. Moreover, the "land" god Yahweh, drowning the enemies of Israel in the water, also adopted the habits of the sea god Ridia.

The second part of the Jews, who went in the opposite direction, to Africa, lingered a bit on the way, looking for tribes among whom they could profitably mingle as traders. There was absolutely no point in sailing along the Red Sea, they tried. There was a continuous waterless desert for almost a thousand kilometers on both banks, even worse than in their historical homeland. They sailed, for a while, along the Blue Nile, but did not meet with mutual understanding, and returned to Ethiopia with the aim of accumulating some strength. But they lingered while they founded the state of Aksum, while they gradually introduced local tribes to trade, who turned out to be real monkeys in their development, this and that, and time went on. Then they tried to move into the jungle directly to the west, but here also the monkeys had not yet turned into people, and refused to trade. But all the time they tried to eat the traders. After many attempts, they managed to establish contact with some people. It turned out that there was a lot of gold and silver here, but the climate was completely unbearable, too humid. Not only was it impossible to settle here permanently, but it was also very dangerous to go on business trips. If anything happened, they would eat you. They corresponded with their homeland using clay tablets. Not only did they receive a reply, but they also sent instructors with a cartload of clay tablets on a new faith for the natives, called Islam. However, many Jews did not like this faith, it insisted too much, albeit pretended, on equality and brotherhood for the people, although they approved of the people's submission to the government. This religion was somehow lopsided, vague. Either the instructors forgot to tell them, or they themselves did not

know it yet, but the Western Jews were not told that they needed to infiltrate not so much trade as the elite of the society of those countries, tribes and peoples among whom they had arrived to organize trade.

The Jewish society split, one part enthusiastically began to introduce Islam, which is almost Judaism, the other part remained adherents of their ancient religion: deceive everyone and everything in your path, make your life beautiful, do not get involved in local palace coups. Perhaps, at this stage, the so-called Jewish wars took place, when the Israelites fought the Jews, ideologically, of course, and not in the form of a bloody real war, as historians tell us. Moreover, historians even mixed up the place, sending us to search for this war in Asia Minor. Although, perhaps, they deliberately disoriented us for their own amusement. The adherents of Islam headed for West Africa for the second time, and, in the end, their efforts were crowned with success: Islam reached the Atlantic and even swam across Gibraltar, albeit not for long. Islam was easy to introduce into Africa, the almost monkeys who were there at that time didn't care, they didn't understand anything about it anyway, and communism was easy for them to inoculate themselves with many years later. Actually, just like for you and me.

Finally, the Jews, also known as neo-Muslims, got tired of the intractability of the Egyptian pharaohs. Having saved up a lot of gold from Ethiopia, but especially from Central Africa, and some of the Yemeni reserves, the Jews set off down the Nile. There was no life at all for a thousand kilometers on either side of it, so they had to sail along this single North African artery, willingly or unwillingly, there was no other way to reach the tribes in the Mediterranean, about whom they had heard a lot. There was no trade there, according to rumors, and in Egypt itself there was no trade either, the pharaoh took everything for himself, for representative expenses. Just as they have been doing in Russia for a thousand years, and to this day, which did not exist yet. I have described all this in my book, but here I will simply add a few things. Actually, the Jews and the Jewish Muslims, having temporarily stopped quarreling over ideology, moved along the Nile to do a common cause, to introduce the Egyptians to trade, since they did not even hope to change the government there. That is why they came to an agreement. In my opinion, they even managed to change the government, or rather, not the principle of government itself, but the royal dynasty. That is when Egypt began to flourish in the field of ancient Egyptian art and science. The Egyptian people, the Egyptians themselves, did not even know that their pharaoh was now a Jew, since nothing had changed in their lives. The sciences and arts flourished “at the top”, just as they did beyond the Red Sea, in Persia and Mesopotamia. But between the East and the West, naturally, all ties were broken. Their ancient homeland itself forgot, or rather, ceased to exist on the ideological basis with which the trading tribe began its campaign. It became a Muslim hinterland, supplying those who needed it with myrrh and frankincense, and a little coffee. That is why we do not know today where the Jews come from.

Meanwhile, the Jewish Judaists and the Jewish Muslims again returned to their ideological quarrels, which became more acute due to the fact that the Jewish Muslims did not allow the Jewish Jews anywhere near the Pharaoh's palace. At this point, we should look into the Old Testament and see what is written there about Moses. And there are nothing but incomprehensibility, tongue twisters and omissions. Firstly, it says that the Jews were taken captive, a long time ago, and in Palestine at that. Regarding this, I immediately thought that it was a complete lie. Even today, going to Palestine for prisoners from Egypt is very expensive: a continuous waterless desert for almost a thousand miles. But now there are airplanes, and cars, and even nuclear-powered ships, not to mention completely autonomous submarines that make fresh water from sea water, and air from it. And how much money would it take to bring, for example, 10 thousand slaves from Palestine? Who would still have to be caught before being transported, and even

fought with before that. But there turned out to be a lot of slaves in Egypt, and they must reproduce in captivity even worse than in a zoo. At least in a zoo they are not forced to work, but they rejoice at every instance of reproduction like children who have found a ball that has fallen under a sofa. Therefore, I also did not believe in reproduction from two Jewish individuals taken into captivity. It remains to admit that the captured Jews are not exactly prisoners, but rather dispossessed relatives of the ruling elite, as I just reported.

Secondly, where has it ever been seen that a slave, even the smartest one like Moses, would be invited every now and then to a meeting in the Kremlin, or rather, to the Pharaoh's palace? Are there not enough smart people there? At least, this is not evident in our Kremlin. And in the American "Kremlin" all sorts of rabble are only allowed in for a tour.

Thirdly, where has it ever been seen that some slave would gather an army in front of the government, when this government is not quite sure where he will send it: against the government itself, or to conquer Siberia for this government? After all, Yermak Timofeevich gathered his army not on Red Square, but in the back streets of Moscovite Rus, and he conquered Siberia not on the orders of our tsar, but as an apologetic gesture to the tsar after he had robbed his subjects. And here the Egyptian pharaoh allowed the recruitment of a parallel army, and is even pondering whether to release it for conquests or leave it at home for its own destruction. A discrepancy, as Soviet criminologists say.

Having weighed all this and some other smaller things, I came to the conclusion that the true Jews, who were not allowed to properly develop in Egypt, led by Moses, who, in principle, according to his worldview, was never allowed into the pharaoh's palace, stealthily created a consortium for Mediterranean trade affairs, and quite legally left the capital. Moreover, the pharaoh and his courtiers, having admired the naked dancers following the example of the "trans-Red Sea" shah-in-shahs, did not even think of engaging in Mediterranean trade. He was fine without trade, together with his brethren. Why trade when you can live well without it, governing a submissive people on the basis of a new Islamic religion and taking from them everything that can be taken away?

But everyone soon forgot about all this, I mean the historians of those times. Or rather, not even that. Who knew how to write in those days? Only the elite, consisting of Jews. And why should they tell the truth about themselves, about their methods? It is better to say that this is what God wants, now not even Yahweh, but Allah. Besides, perhaps the ancient historians did say something close to the truth, but there was no printing press yet to record events in many copies, which is why, despite the existence of the printing press, a rather stupid saying arose that manuscripts do not burn. Each subsequent tsar ordered their manuscripts to be rewritten at his own discretion and his own "understanding" of events, for example, like Comrade Stalin. And how many Stalins were there? Napoleon also rewrote. And Hitler. And right now, China, Ukraine and about twenty other countries are rewriting history. Why shouldn't the pharaohs rewrite it? And in a single copy, too.

And the Bible? It's also a history book, nothing more, although a bit unique. But that's how they reasoned back then, not caring too much about logic, which didn't even exist back then. And note that the Bible should be the same for everyone, since it was canonized and forbidden to change. And what do we see? We see the Orthodox Bible, the Catholic Bible, and another twenty or so exotic Bibles, if not more, like the Mormon Bible. And they all differ, and not in lines or paragraphs, but in entire sections. One Bible has such and such a section, another doesn't, one says one thing, and another says the opposite. That is, we

have several dozen versions of the Bible, which very often interpret events differently. Well, imagine that, for example, Tolstoy's "War and Peace" was written in thirty versions that did not agree with each other, and all of them belonged to Tolstoy's pen, like the Koran to the prophet Mohammed.

However, we must return to Moses' trading army. For details of the conquest of the Mediterranean and the construction of a customs house on the Bosphorus under the name of Byzantium, I refer you to my book, but here I will only briefly report on his and his successor Jesus Navin's deeds. There was no Byzantium. There was simply a city on the Bosphorus called Tsargrad, Constantinople, later Istanbul, surrounded by three rows of walls. A chain was stretched across the strait, one end of which was wound around a gate inside these walls, thereby closing or opening the way for ships. They charged a fee for the passage of ships with salt and timber, and they lived richly. Then Cosimo Medici plundered this city, took everything, but most importantly - handwritten books, on the basis of which he created "Neoplatonism", and on the basis of the latter - Catholicism. In my opinion, he was also a Jew, since he was the first banker.

But not only Byzantium, that is, practically only one city of Byzantium, was created by Jews. This was their last point. At the same time and a little earlier, traders were developing the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, including the city of Byblos, to which many attribute the creation of the Bible, including myself (see my book "The Mysterious Russian Soul Against the Background of World Jewish History"). In other words, the Jews, who became the ancient Greeks, took a fancy to exclusively all the warm shores of the Mediterranean Sea, especially its southeastern shores. Here, in convenient places, in natural bays, they founded trading cities, including on the Adriatic. The harbor cities were separated from the rest of the land by walls, and the Jews did not even know very well who lived behind their walls. Different people, the aborigines of these places, simply came from the continent, brought goods for sale and bought themselves what they needed, and then disappeared into the depths of their land. The Jews were not particularly interested in them. But the natives themselves appreciated the intelligence, commercial acumen and other virtues of the traders, especially their literacy. And it must be said that all these qualities of the traders, accumulated over their generations, until they reached these places from Yemen, made them much higher in all respects than the surrounding tribes, who aslways remained fools in trade. Naturally, they did not like this, hence the envy, resentment, which arise only when the trade deal is already done, and after a fight, as they say, do not wave your fists. So they were "expelled" from time to time, but they quickly returned, because without them it was even worse to live: there was always an overstocking of one product with the most acute shortage of all the others.

Of course, the Byzantine Jews under the pseudonym of the ancient Greeks and the Turkish Jews met here and there, for example, in Trebizond, in the Khazar Khaganate or even in Byzantium itself. But they pretended not to recognize each other. Well, how can I say? I have a quote on this from the New Chronology of Earth Civilizations by Valyansky and Kalyuzhny: "A bronze Italian medal from 1481 (1453 – the capture of Constantinople by the "Turks" – mine) is known with the image of Sultan Mohammed II and the inscription "Sultani Mohammet Octhomani VGVLI. Bizantii Inperatoris", which means: Sultan Mohammed of Ottoman, Emperor of Byzantium. Further: "The body of Constantine (XI, Byzantine – mine), who died during the storming of the city, was buried with honor, and according to some evidence, an inextinguishable lamp was lit over his grave by order of the new Turkish government". Invaders do not do this, and the "captured" do not knock out medals in honor of the invaders.

The Turks simply decided that they would now collect the Bosphorus duties themselves, and would do it without the Jews. Although no one expelled the Jews themselves, just as they did not expel the Christians,

that is, the "Greeks". "Orthodox religious institutions were preserved and continued their services. (They continue to this day, I will add). The person of the patriarch, bishops and priests was recognized as inviolable, all clergy were exempt from taxes". I am saying that the Turks only took control of customs. But the Jews, forgive me, the "Greeks", were offended and fled all over Europe, including to organize a new faith - Catholicism. The Jews would have noted this fact in history as the first literate people, as another persecution of the Jews, but they had already called themselves "Greeks", it was inconvenient. Especially since the "Greek" language at that time was understood in the Apennines by both old and young. After all, all church services were conducted, and books were written, in Greek. Latin "came into being" much later. Why, none of the historians speak of it. Today, the "Greek" language is not understood in the Apennines.

And I know why. Because Cosimo de Medici at that time "bought out" all the "Greek" manuscripts from Mohammed II and created the Platonic Academy (details in the book), which quickly rewrote the entire world history. Then they put the Catholic priests Scaliger and Petavius at their desks and they, just as quickly, compiled a new chronology for the new history, which, by the way, Isaac Newton was very unhappy with, and greatly corrected it. But the "public" at that time never learned about it.

Renan confirms my concept of the history of the Jews

Introduction

The traditional beginning of the history of the Jews in Jerusalem is known to everyone. Ernest Renan described it in 800 pages of super-dense text in his encyclopedia-style book, The History of the Israeli People, published in full in 1893 (V. Shevchuk Publishing House, Moscow, 2001, based on the first Russian edition of 1912) with such details that you won't find in any other book. Naturally, Renan has a concept for compiling this history, that is, the development of humanity itself. This concept is also well-known, it has not changed to this day and is the basis of the entire historical cause-and-effect canvas that is still used by traditional "academic" historians. This concept of the historical development of humanity is based on wars, migrations of peoples, statehood, and the dynastic ups and downs of rulers.

This concept is fundamentally wrong, which is why it is very difficult for historians to write the history of humanity. Every now and then they come across ancient documents that contradict this concept. If nothing at all can be extracted from these documents to support the notorious concept, then it is pretended that such documents do not exist at all. If they provide something "pleasing" to the "treasury of human knowledge", but contradict this "treasury" even more and it is no longer possible to "correct" this document, since it has been printed, then references are made such as: "in this Herodotus, Plutarch, Flavius ... and so on, are mistaken. The river flows in the wrong direction ..., the people are not called this way, but that way ..., this dynasty is not the 14th, but the 5th ..., and in general so-and-so has messed up a lot". This is similar to the situation when a judge selectively perceives each testimony of a witness, according to his sophisticated taste. This is the difference between a court and a "court of history".

It is also quite obvious that the war, migrations, statehood and dynasties of rulers that I mentioned are very large sections of the concept, each of which can be almost infinitely divided into smaller parts. It is about these details that historians are waging a war of "schools", on the roof of each of which sits a "founder" in the form of a statue. All these "schools" are fighting among themselves not for life, but to the death, like "the Greeks with the Persians", and that is why they cannot agree on changing the concept as a whole. They do not have enough time and energy for this. Especially since they are all on the payroll of the "history" department. Here, for example, is what Renan, the most intelligent of historians, writes.

"Demetrius, Aristeas, Cleodemus or Malachi still retained, apparently, a certain seriousness in their supposedly historical efforts. Eupolemus and Artapan (or at least the Jew hiding under this strange name) knew no bounds in their charlatan inventions. Artapan tells us that the **Egyptians received all their knowledge and all their institutions from the Jews. Abraham taught astrology to King Pharatotes, Joseph rendered the Egyptians an infinite number of services. The most famous Egyptian temples were built by the sons of Jacob. The entire Egyptian cult is the creation of Moses. <…> These childish inventions** were sometimes set out in verse. They were written in bad hexameters…" (Highlighted by me).

But according to my concept of the development of history, this is exactly how it is, and I will prove it with the help of Renan himself. It is a pity that Renan died long ago, otherwise he would have had to take back his very offensive words "allegedly historical attempts", "charlatan inventions".

According to the same “generally accepted concept” that the “ancient Greeks” sprang up like mushrooms on a tiny patch of land and created a great culture out of thin air, which immediately disappeared into thin air, Renan is completely indigestibly verbose, pushing us with “subtle hints” so that we do not doubt that the Jews have nothing to do with the flourishing of Ancient Greece. But I know perfectly well that it is the Jews who are essentially the ancient Greeks. So that you understand how helpless Renan is, I will give a rather long quote.

“These proud but benevolent gentlemen (the Greeks – mine) liked the Jews for their flexibility and their **humility**. They were **good clerks**, good managers, good **lower** officials. <…> Much of what the Jewish historians tell us on this subject must be attributed to the need to give themselves more importance and **must be recognized as an exaggeration**. <…> **Like all small people who have been favored by the powerful of this world**, they try to forget nothing of the attentions they have received and **greedily note** everything that, in their opinion, is capable of elevating them in public opinion. Thus Josephus is proud of the fact that the Alexandrian sons of his people lived "in close relations with the kings", he asserts that during the reign of Philometor and Cleopatra the Jews dominated the court and that, according to his expression, "these two sovereigns entrusted their kingdom to the Jews”. <…> All this is doubtful ... Jewish vanity surrounded these first steps of Hellenistic Judaism with such a **tissue of falsifications** that it is very difficult to distinguish the apocryphal from the reality in this **obscure section** of Jewish history. It seems true that it was during the reign of Philometor (170 – 150 BC) that the Alexandrian Jews came into close contact with Hellenism, that it was then that the spirit of competition took possession of them, and in im**itation of the Greeks they began to write in Greek**”.

I will interrupt the ventriloquist for a second to say: the “Greek” letters alpha, beta and gamma “in Greek” do not mean anything material, while in Hebrew aleph is a bull, bet is a house, gimmel is a camel. So it was not the Jews who “wrote in Greek”, but the “Greeks” who wrote in Hebrew. And I will continue to quote the indigestible: “**The miserable and often completely false** historical works that inspired such little justified confidence in Jewish and Christian apologists were the product of that, one might say, disease that was caused in the Israeli people by the **too rapid inoculation of Hellenism**” (p. 608).

Renan heard the cry of the statue of the “founder” from the “roof of the building” of the historical concept and began to perform his passes like our Petrushka’s somersaults on hemp ropes. It seems I have digressed a little. But I will still note that according to my concept, it was the Jews who created Ancient Egypt and Ancient Greece. I have more details in my other works. But Renan does not like this at all, he gets angry and is a little rude. By the way, the Russian verb "хамит" comes from the biblical name Ham.

So, why is the historical concept based on wars, migration of peoples, statehood and dynastic vicissitudes of rulers incorrect?

I will start with statehood. It is easy to prove that there was no Roman Empire or other empires like the Macedonian Empire and could not have been. An empire of conquest can be created only in one case, when there is a difference in weapons technology, for example, atomic bombs or at least guns versus bows and arrows and wooden clubs. After all, in an empire there are always ten times fewer conquerors than conquered. And when for every conqueror's dagger there is a kitchen knife of a potential slave, for every sabre there is a scythe with which to mow the grass, one state cannot conquer not only a dozen states, but even one state equal in population. Bandit raids like Macedonian's raid to India or Kovpak's "behind enemy lines" in the last world war can be carried out. But this is not the conquest and creation of a large state. This is a simple bandit raid, like on a modern apartment: they swooped in, robbed, left, and life goes on completely sovereign. Therefore, to understand in ancient times a state as today with a border and a track strip, customs and other attributes of modernity is the height of childish logic. Like the babble of a hungry baby that he loves garlic, because garlic smells like sausage.

To understand the other attributes of the "historical concept" we need modern examples. Let's say some kind of cataclysm occurred on Earth, God forbid, of course, in reality. And all the libraries, the Internet, the film disappeared. Even the newspaper files disappeared. And fifty or seventy years later, humanity was reborn and became interested in its history. But first I must give another example, related to a period of 50-70 years. Otherwise, you will not understand what this means, stuffed with the official history of humanity for several thousand years.

Imagine, especially young people under forty, that fifty or seventy years ago, approximately 80 percent of our women walked around, forgive me, without panties, without anything at all, wearing only a “bodysuit”, as Vysotsky expressed it, a type of nightgown, and a sarafan with a blouse over it. And if I had not said that this was only 50 years ago, then you would undoubtedly have thought that they wore this kind of clothes “before our era”, about five or six thousand years ago. Please remember that the steam locomotive and the steamship were invented only, roughly speaking, 200 years ago, and today young people don’t even remember what it is? I’m not even talking about the fact that a modern desktop “pentium” with vacuum tubes would hardly have fit in a stadium thirty years ago. And I was completely stunned by the answers of modern schoolchildren from all countries, published in the newspaper, to the elementary question of who fought with whom in the last world war. This is already from the realm of a madhouse, it’s embarrassing to quote. That is, I want to say that humanity remembers only its own life and a few grandparents, if the latter took them to kindergarten. Now it’s time to return to the catastrophe I invented.

The reborn humanity remembers nothing except mom and dad and starts digging (archaeology). They come across a pair of women's shoes stuffed with crumpled newspaper so that they would not lose their shape before the catastrophe. Then a boot with the same thing. Then they find five thousand bundles of all kinds of newspapers in different parts of the world, once prepared for kindling a stove. I will not describe in detail the excavations in the toilets of the "hole" type - the largest and most complete source of the ancient "Qumran papyri". All these "treasures" are dried, smoothed out, sorted by name, place of discovery and laid out in piles. Then they start reading. I'd better keep silent about "start reading", since this is too complex a topic for a popular presentation, I will only say that there are as many texts as there are readers, and they

do not coincide in a single word. Therefore, one of the interpretations is adopted by law, the head of which becomes the "founder" and his statue is placed on the roof.

Then an interesting question arises: how old are these newspapers? Naturally, dates are immediately found, for example, 2002, there are no newspapers older than that. But there are no newspapers younger than 1600, for example. They do not know, as we know, that the first newspaper was published in England somewhere around that year. And as luck would have it, not a single newspaper found mentions the birth of Christ. Maybe it is mentioned here and there, but the "founder" as a statue says that... and so on. In general, see the quotes from Renan above. The path back into the depths of the centuries is cut off. But forward - the same emptiness: how many years have passed from the last day of the newspapers to the time of the beginning of reading? After all, no one remembers anything. And he doesn't even know what year it is now after that last one, 2002? Although this is easier, you can start a "new era" from the date of birth of the statue's model, everyone knows how many years ago it was born. If I had my way, I would order that the study of history in school be started with this example, and not hammer in the "order" of its course, established by the statue, by order.

We need to move on to history itself, to life events. I don't read foreign newspapers, except for quotations from them, given to me in our newspapers. I know Russian newspapers better, so I will dwell entirely on them. So, before the researchers, who know neither kinship, nor the "beginning of the BC", nor the very "recently past era", lie thousands of pieces of paper from the toilet in Russian, washed, smoothed out and no longer smelling at all. And here I will only give specific examples at random, since I don’t have enough imagination for all these papers.

Historians will quickly notice that 2001 and part of 2002 are almost entirely dedicated to some Trans-Siberian Railway, which was not mentioned in the papers either earlier or later. So historians will decide that the Trans-Siberian Railway was specially built so that the “sun” of some great eastern empire named Kim Jong-il, like the famous (to us, but not to them) Genghis Khan, could conquer the Moscovite kingdom. And President Putin began to pay this khan a tribute collected from all his vassals, hiding part of the money, like Ivan Kalita, for future revival. I am 100% sure that the papers will be deciphered exactly like this.

Here historians will immediately notice the Chechen war, which they will consider the third world war. For they will first read about the second world war, described after its end 50 years later. From these same articles historians will learn that earlier there was already one Chechen war, which lasted almost a hundred years, and they will call it a hundred-year war, since information about that war will be very scanty. It will only be known that it was between two states: Russia and Chechnya, similar to the Anglo-French war, which we know about from our modern school. The horrors of this world Chechen war will be exactly the same in new books for schoolchildren as about Attila for our schoolchildren, where human bodies are depicted roasting on a spit, like bulls in later times. And it will be considered a world war because they will find photographs of Western European heads in the snow, discover French and other hostages, learn that Khattab is from Jordan, Bin Laden is from Saudi Arabia, but is fighting in Afghanistan, and is again financing Chechnya. Undoubtedly, Bosnia and Kosovo will end up in this same world Chechen war, since the generals' names will be practically the same. And the Americans with their loser general, I forgot his name, will also end up in this war.

Have you forgotten yet that historians will not use newspaper files, but pieces of paper from a Russian toilet? That is, the information will be very fragmentary, both literally and figuratively. Therefore, some

historians will even come to the conclusion that Kim Jong-il started this war, and built the Trans-Siberian Railway after the war in order to transport Russian tribute to himself, though, if this war ever really ends. Do you see how coherent the story is? Maybe I should put a statue on the roof already? And I haven't said anything about Pakistan, our aid to Iran and Saddam, and the snorts of the Americans about it. I haven't said anything about "globalism and globalists", whom historians will certainly connect with the Chechen war through our president's trips to the G7-G8 meeting. Just as Stalin was connected with Churchill through Armenian cognac and with Roosevelt through Yalta and the American's security in Tehran.

Now do you understand that history should always be written in the subjunctive mood, and not in a cut-to-size form? Let all the translations of "clay tablets" live in equal status. I am even ready to throw all the statues of the "founders" off the roof, let at least my person stand there.

I haven't said anything about dynasties and the migration of peoples. I hope that you will understand wars and statehood as well as I do, so I have finished with them. As for “Abel gave birth to…” and so on, here we will have to resort to modern knowledge. And they say that in fact not a single royal dynasty went beyond the third or fourth generation, when some unplanned spermatozoon in the form of a handsome page, coachman or “bed-boy” got there. Therefore, the history of the kingdom-state had to be written anew, from scratch. And not only for this reason. Some new tsars, even kindred spirits, even if not by blood, but by party, stopped liking the history he had written earlier, and he again rewrote it, starting from scratch, not only figuratively, but also really. I do not even want to give examples, suffice it to say that not only genealogical books, but even constitutions in Russia have been at least five or six over the past hundred years. Therefore, one should not pay attention to dynasties in history at all. And if there is nothing to write in history except dynastic nonsense, then it is better to leave blank pages in this place. For dynasties have no relation to history. Like the curls on letters to the content of words.

Regarding the migration of peoples, it is necessary to say a little more in detail, since this same thing is not immediately obvious. I have specifically studied this issue, where the fact of the migration of peoples can be trusted. For example, the centers of settlement of the Tatars and Chuvashes in the vast expanses of Siberia all the way to Baikal. So, the centers of these peoples are located on the map strictly along the parallel on which their main area is based. To the parallel it is necessary to add the landscape, relief and average annual temperature, which should be in the original norm. This is visible on the American continent, and in general everywhere on Earth. Small fluctuations around this rule can be observed in Siberia, when with the arrival of the Russians, who occupied large rivers, local tribes moved to their more remote taiga tributaries, where there were no newcomers. Nowhere in modern history, which is reliable, has there been any migration of peoples along the meridian, unless we consider as such a migration the replacement of the corresponding parallel with the corresponding parallel of the other hemisphere, where, like in a drop of water, the same, although "opposite", climate is reflected. This is the first.

Second. Never and nowhere has there been a migration of peoples in full force, as is written in history about the Jews, Mongols, Seljuk Turks, Khazars and so on. The settlement of America almost before our eyes confirms this. Under appropriate conditions, peoples change their language and beliefs very quickly, but first, all the same, beliefs. Peoples migrate according to the principle: fish look for where it is deeper, and man - where it is better. These are renegades from the people, who, having moved to new places, find such favorable conditions that they begin to multiply almost uncontrollably, and under certain conditions can exceed their numbers over the number that remained in their homeland. This is even visible in the city of Moscow. But the homeland for any first-generation immigrants always remains the best place in the

world, where their souls remain, despite the manna from heaven that rains down on them from the new sky. Therefore, I have every reason to say that there were no migrations of peoples either in ancient times or even before the new era. And, by the way, half of history is occupied with the migration of peoples.

The only people who did not even migrate, but simply entered into all the pores of other peoples, partially turning into these peoples, are the Jews. But they had no other choice. Too many Jews in one place cannot feed the people they have infiltrated. This topic is the subject of my new view of history, which is too early to talk about. The main thing I want to say now is that even Jews who are forced to migrate, mostly migrate and thicken the environment beyond measure, even to their own detriment, precisely where the climate is not only maritime, but also reminiscent of the climate of Yemen. And only in the most extreme and last case, when they absolutely have to rub against each other, they force their way into cold countries. So in Siberia there are only a few of them, and in Chukotka - only one, Governor Abramovich.

Thus, the concept on which history is based is completely far-fetched, scholastic, and should be discarded. In defense of historians, I will say that they found too many pieces of paper from the toilet, they are dumbfoundedly sorting through them, moving them from pile to pile, and they simply have no time to think about the root of the problem. Moreover, since ancient times and centuries they have been forging these pieces of paper, tearing them up and throwing them in toilets all over the Earth, and then “finding” them only to “prove their vision”, so that their image can be dragged onto the roof and written - “founder”. Well, and, of course, for the money that comes to them from the tsars, who are very concerned not so much about their dynasty as about their vile deeds, which should be made “more beautiful”. In addition, historians are justified by the fact that papers from toilets naturally come from newspapers, which, in turn, are compiled by masters of their craft who love to eat well. And only tsars can allow a good meal, who like it when newspapers discuss their own problems by eighty percent, and leave twenty percent for discussing the problems of the people, and in the “vision” from the tsar’s throne. Therefore, 80 percent of papers found over the centuries should be thrown away without regret, without reading, to where they were taken from. But which of the historians-archaeologists who have found such papers will agree with this? As a result, this is precisely why the historical concept I criticize exists, an approach to history on four legs: wars, migrations of peoples, statehood, and dynastic lists. In other words, history is 80 percent worthless. The spaces between these four whale-legs are filled with poetry and prose, which is even more worthless for history (not for literature), and it becomes very boring to read, downright nauseous, unless, of course, you get paid for it. It is not for nothing that 80 percent of schoolchildren dislike history so much.

So I decided, what if we try to throw away 80 percent of historical knowledge at the first stage, and apply a new concept to the remaining 20 percent, consisting of a set of categories of ordinary human common sense? What interests the common people from the beginning of the centuries to the present day? Firstly, food. Secondly, sex on a full stomach is the primary reason for the reproduction of nations. Thirdly, simple human ambitions, expressed by strength, cunning, intelligence, dexterity and luck. It is not for nothing that I separated cunning from intelligence, because they are rarely compatible. For luck, a god is needed, and this is the most insoluble riddle, the study of the components of which does not make the riddle clearer, but, on the contrary, makes the cause of luck even darker, even today, at the height of scientific and technological progress. Simple human ambitions are very diverse and multidirectional, and are determined by preference, the roots of which are as dark as the roots of luck. Some prefer to collect butterflies in forests and fields on an empty stomach, others - to boast of their knowledge to the people like a child with ice cream on the

street during the war, a third - wants to command for the sake of the desire to oppress both their own and others. After all, it is infinity.

But in this infinity you can find some streams that more or less unite people in their preferences. This is similar to stochastic processes in mathematics. These processes consist of random functions, individual implementations of which, in turn, can be more or less accurately conveyed by one equation - the mathematical expectation of a random function. The trouble is that historians for the most part hate mathematics, that's why they go to study to become historians. Traditional historians and mathematicians are enemies in preferences, they not only do not understand each other, but do not want to understand each other. Historians love only poetics in history, while mathematicians want to find logic there. But there is no strict logic in history. Mathematicians and historians need to bring their positions closer together, but it is the historians themselves who should bring these positions closer together to a greater extent. Historical poetry can be understood and recognized by a part of mathematicians, but mathematicians in their entirety will never agree to the absence of strict logic in history. Historians feel like big shots in their own field and look down on the "wishes" of mathematicians for greater logic. This comes from childhood resentment at their inability to mathematical logic back in school, which they carry over into adulthood, displacing it according to Freud and replacing it with a dislike for the opinions of mathematicians as such.

I have not come across a universal law on the influence of the environment on the formation of intelligence in history books; it is not even mentioned, despite the fact that myriads of examples in support of this law are scattered haphazardly in the books. By history books I mean not only purely historical ones, but also a whole complex of descriptive sciences, such as ethnography, linguistics, anthropology, even animal life and livestock breeding. For all these sciences are essentially sections of history. I immediately decided to put this law at the forefront of the history of mankind.

Historians, overburdened with wars, statehood, migration of peoples and ruling dynasties, the very same material from toilets that makes up 80 percent of their "finds", pay absolutely little attention to the substantive meaning of trade, although they use this term every now and then. Trade in history is viewed completely according to childish logic, if not to say idiotic: in history, they trade, to put it in a modern way, only diamonds and nothing more. Historians sometimes have the "silk road", sometimes the "spice road", sometimes the "route from the Varangians to the Greeks with sables", as if all the peoples around walked around in silks and sables, ate only ginger and pepper, sniffed ebony and smoked incense every now and then. Meanwhile, the number one commodity in ancient times was simple table salt, which was obtained in the most primitive way and of the highest quality in any quantities only in the lower reaches of the Volga, on the lakes Elton and Baskunchak. And without salt, purely physiologically, no person could do. I managed to scrape together amazing details about salt in purely random messages from historians, but I gleaned most of the information from geology. (Details in my other works).

The second item of trade, millions of times greater in volume than "spices", is timber, the wood of "construction" species, which united the northern and southern countries. History knows nothing about this trade item, except for the biblical "Lebanese cedars", replacing it with "Russian hemp", as if cotton "hemp" or Indian jute (hemp) were worse.

The third trade item is the trade in people, slaves, but except for the notorious Kafa (Feodosia), practically nothing is known about this trade, which has been so widespread since the dawn of mankind, except for inarticulate mooing. Historians have reclassified all this normal, wide trade as military booty, and

spoke only of "military slaves", which, if you think about it for more than three minutes, is complete nonsense. A military slave, in the absence of trade itself, became a full-fledged member of the conqueror's family after a generation. And even a simple serf who sold himself into serfdom for vodka, in the absence of trade, will also become a member of his master's family.

Finally, in my opinion, one cannot consider the languages and writing of peoples without knowing why they are essentially needed. And only after answering this question, we can move on. Only primitive answers to this question, like the one that writing is needed for love notes, and the language itself is for declaring love, should be immediately thrown into the trash bin as a defective product. A language with a wide range of words and especially writing are needed for something more global, if we take into account the kinship in almost all languages of the simplest concepts denoted by words, especially the numerals from one to five, nine and the attractive pronouns of the first person. And then trade will immediately come to mind, international, I emphasize this. (More about this in my other works).

In the history of mankind, Jews occupy too large a place for historians not to notice this, but to this day they cannot understand, as it seems to me, how exactly the Jews deserved this primacy in world history. Historians "entrusted" them only with the creation of the original principles of religion, from which all other most significant religions originated. And this is very little, monstrously little. And the reason is that the historical concept that I have so mercilessly criticized is fundamentally wrong. The Jews have never fought, if you don’t count the Judeo-Israeli wars, which are not really wars in the literal sense, but only ideological wars. The Jews have never really had a state, if you don’t count the fiction about Jerusalem. Two of the four main historical pillars are thus missing. There was not a single voluntary resettlement of the Jews, much less a conquering one like the Mongols. They were simply forcibly resettled five or six times by all sorts of foreign kings, not counting the countless “expulsions”. Therefore, for historians, they turned out to be simple pawns, moved by the clumsy hand of a bad chess player. And without the three listed and fundamental “whales” in traditional history, based only on the dynastic squabbles described in the Bible, the real historical significance of the Jews cannot only be shown, but even found in the thicket of toilet papers.

Now I can briefly outline my concept of the development of world history, in which almost all the achievements of civilization belong to the Jews. And the religion they created is not at all the main achievement of the Jewish contribution to civilization. Except, of course, military field achievements, although military technology also belongs to them, in particular, "Greek fire". Read more about this in more detail and substantiated in my other works, because this work, as is evident from the title, is devoted to the evidence of my idea, gleaned from Renan, against his will, of course.

So, in the desert on a high-mountain plateau, on the border of present-day Yemen and Saudi Arabia, tribes lived in unbearably difficult environmental conditions, when year after year with the growth of the population life became more and more difficult and hopeless. They had to fight for every day they lived. The collective brain of the tribes in the struggle for life became more and more powerful. (Remember the law?) Some daredevils, having descended from the plateau into a narrow coastal plain, saw paradise on earth. That's when the idea of the promised land arose. The tribes, it must be said, never fought among themselves because of the difficulties of life, it would have been a completely unnecessary, destructive luxury for them. Therefore, they did not conquer the coastal paradise with free fish, fruits and other benefits, it did not occur to them at all. They turned on their collective brain at full speed and invented a method, thanks to which they easily managed to penetrate the coastal tribes, who turned out to be real rich

fools compared to them. This method was trade, primitive exchange. After a certain number of years, this exchange was transformed into an exchange "here" for the exchange of what was exchanged "there", where you can get a trading profit. The "bad" tribes were very grateful to the traders, since they received their interests, consisting of a variety of products. Therefore, they did not resist the presence of traders. By the way, they are called "trading tribes" in history. As you know, even algebra is the science of settlers. Only historians, touching on this issue, do not want to dwell on it in more detail, plagued by Tradition. They say that they need to find a clay tablet where what I am talking about would be written, and in pure English, so that there would be no misinterpretations. Otherwise: "the origin of the Jews is not proven".

But the main profit was received by primitive traders, and only they themselves knew about it. Oh, many historical conclusions follow from this. Firstly, the main breadwinner became the man - the head of the family, constantly absent on business. Therefore, they switched to patriarchy, and imposed the strictest penance on their smiling women, humiliating them in every possible way in anticipation of humility. Even Solomonia in their totemic tales from then on began to be called the wise Solomon.

Secondly, with prosperity the birth rate increased, and the traders began to quickly overtake the coastal peoples in the addition of families, into which they had so cleverly penetrated. And this, in turn, raised their status. A certain comparative wealth of the traders did not hinder this, but contributed to it. But it was necessary to strengthen this disunited world among the natives into a single whole. So that they would feel each other's elbow at a distance of kilometers, and even further. Otherwise, they were threatened with assimilation and the loss of the status of the emerging nation, so advantageous for life. They prayed, like all the others, to a dozen or more gods, and this did not bring them together, but separated them, and besides, separated by the burdens of trade.

Therefore, thirdly, they thought about an idea that would bring them together. There is nothing better than monotheism, in those times, as well as in the present, although monotheism can also be called socialism or the Soviet system. Everyone praying to Yahweh alone, according to Freud, is identification with one's own kind, and identification with society as a whole. But here Moses, due to his inexperience, made a mistake. He wanted merchants to be honest within their society, to love their parents and to fulfill other virtues of the moral code of the Decalogue of the "First Law" (see my other works). After all, when he compiled it, he thought that it would be too wasteful to devote all ten commandments of Yahweh to Yahweh himself. Something should be devoted to morality, otherwise the Jews (I will now call merchants exactly that) have become too talkative from the sudden satiety.

Moses or his successors, as Renan claims (but it is not important) quickly realized their mistake. The Jews' heads became so confused that there was no talk of any intra-clan identification. The people could not understand who to please first: Yahweh or morality? Therefore, the smart guy separated, as they say: the soup separately, and the flies separately. Or, more understandably: to God - what is God's, and to the bull - what is the bull's. That is, he created Deuteronomy, in which all ten commandments are dedicated to Yahweh and the actual identification of the Jews, and sent morality to the court for consideration. From now on, Yahweh was not interested in the affairs of the people who worshiped him in relation to each other, and Deuteronomy was entirely and completely dedicated to the identification of the Jews among themselves in their love and reverence for Yahweh. Therefore, the Jews are still united even at a distance of thousands of kilometers, and do not stand with their legs apart between faith and truth like all other peoples. Details in my other works.

Fourthly, to the previous points and to all the following ones it should be added that the Jews, who had already been working a lot with their heads in their desert, not only did not stop working with their heads after moving to the coast, but, on the contrary, intensified this process, since trade alone took up a lot of mental energy, not to mention everything else. That is, their brains were constantly under stress, and every day a new convolution appeared in them, responsible for a certain area of various mental activity. This was very noticeable among neighboring aboriginal tribes, yes, it is noticeable today.

Fifthly, it was necessary to improve the rules of trade, but before that it was still necessary to expand its volume, but mainly, the radius of its action. The fact is that there should be no more than 5-6 percent of traders per capita of the indigenous population, otherwise the competitive struggle among traders will kill the most mentally retarded, and this could not be allowed, after all, they are relatives. Therefore, the penetration of Jews into the depths of ever more distant tribes grew, and the increased birth rate from a well-fed life compensated for this expansion. It became difficult to run to each other for advice and support, so elementary writing was invented, maybe even hieroglyphic at first, like the Chinese. In addition, it was necessary to know where, what was exchanged for what, and in what proportion. Therefore, hieroglyphs were relatively quickly abandoned, having made the greatest invention on Earth - alphabetic writing. In connection with this, I would mercilessly execute scientists (a joke!) who claim that alphabetic writing is allegedly invented casually by peoples, almost each one separately. Details in my other works, mainly in the as yet unpublished book "The Mysterious Russian Soul against the Background of World Jewish History".

Sixthly, the time came for the actual improvement of trade. This improvement is a consequence of distance. First, trade credit appeared, marked with letters on clay tablets, then price lists at different points, to make it easier to make purchases for resale. Although a little earlier than the price list and credit, money probably did appear, for example, from shells. I got them mixed up out of excitement. And I forgot to tell him that at the same time, the Jews began to sail the sea, along the coast and on hired boats rented from the natives. From then on, the Jews for all time had a craving for water, whether salty or fresh, and many pages of Jewish history are devoted to it, which Renan completely unfairly takes away from them. I found enough confirmation of this version, but I will not quote myself. After all, Renan died, and you can all read my other works.

It seems we should move on to the relationship of the Jews with the surrounding peoples, through which they were filtered like water through sand, and the routes of their spread around the world. First of all, it should be mentioned again that the mental development of the Jews, on average, was far ahead of even the earliest aboriginal Einsteins. I think this is clear from the above. Therefore, the first Jews to appear in any country, although there were no countries in their current understanding, were treated with great respect, they knew too much. And this respect was felt even in the tsars and princes, who only knew how to swing a club well. This greatly helped both in trade and in security. And in the Jews it developed the ability to communicate without a fight even with the devil.

Conversations between the aborigines were limited to the words: I love, I want, meat, water, to drink and eat, well, and another two or three dozen words. For what did they have to talk about, when everything was clear anyway. But in communication with the merchant who appeared like a jack-in-the-box, these words were clearly not enough. Firstly, counting. It may have been among specific natives, but it was quickly forgotten during trade, since the Jews did not want to learn thirty words at once, meaning, for example, “two”, while it was easy to unobtrusively force them to learn one Hebrew word “two”. Do you understand where I am getting at? After all, it is elementary. Meanwhile, scientists racked their brains, inventing an

Indo-European family of languages, in which the word “two” sounds the same everywhere. Details in my other works, for example, “Linguistics”. The same was done with other “trade” words. I even suspect that the most vivid, short, informative words, which inadvertently appeared among the natives, found application in the Jewish dictionary, and through it began to spread more widely. But still, the more trade expanded, the more it covered large masses of people, the more the vocabulary of all the peoples participating in Jewish trade converged. And the "families" of languages among linguists expanded over the centuries. To the rather idiotic "Indo-European family of languages" was added an even more idiotic "tree of Afro-Asiatic languages", a branch of which were the "Semitic-Hamitic languages". In general, complete idiocy.

Having mastered the Yemen-Aden coast, the Jews sailed to India on one side, and to Ethiopia on the other. The crossing points were very convenient, look at the map. So the Jews initially had only two tribes, as is proper for physically normal people. Here they left the same words, which later scientists attributed to the Indo-European family on the one hand, and to the Afro-Asiatic on the other, although at first, of course, to the Semito-Hamitic, which upon closer examination is still Semitic. As for the “tribes”, this was later, when the Jews penetrated the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, Egypt, which, it seems to me, was previously called differently. It is not for nothing that scientists still cannot count them, sometimes they get twelve, sometimes thirteen, sometimes almost all will disappear, sometimes almost all will be discovered again. This is not the essence of history. I have details in other works. Here I will only say that their greatest achievements were, firstly, the Constantinople customs with a chain across the strait and the "Greeks" around. Secondly, the Khazar Khaganate at the crossroads of all salt roads. Thirdly, Alexandria and distant Gibraltar. Details are also in other works. Their final triumph was in Catholic Italy, but here they made a mistake with God, although they created a world bank headed by Cosimo Medici. As for the orthodox faith, Orthodoxy, Catholicism and Islam, I thought about this too and decided that all this was also the work of the Jews. They could not share their Yahweh with peoples whom they despised in the depths of their souls. Moreover, if they had done so, they would have lost their complete superiority. Therefore, they suggested to the local kings how to make the religion of monotheism. However, they hid the fact that they were using Deuteronomy purified of moral dogmas, and instead of it they slipped them their own "First Law" that failed to justify itself, which we still stubbornly call "Deuteronomy" by mistake. Details in my other works, in particular, in the collection of articles "The Missing Link of History".

Now I will move on to the proof of all this and much more with information gleaned from Ernest Renan and Arthur Koestler. But first I will turn to Renan. I will need Koestler only for the Khazars.

Renan

Instead of an introduction

I will immediately report that Renan was excommunicated from the church for his historical works, that he "declared himself a supporter of the method of historical intuition" according to S. Dubnov in 1907, that he was elected a full member of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences in 1860, a year before the abolition of serfdom. But here is what is interesting. The cited work by Renan was first published in Russia in 1907, the second edition came out almost a hundred years later, in 2001. At the same time, a colossal work was done "on the translation" of the pre-revolutionary "letterhead", which modern youth could hardly read, into a readable modern text. Renan's book "Marcus Aurelius and the End of the Ancient World", published 10 years earlier in a reprint reproduction of the beginning of the last century, probably showed that no one

wants to mentally translate the signs of letters that have fallen into disuse into current signs. But the very fact of introducing books that have not been reprinted for a hundred years into our minds says a lot and, above all, that they are trying to renew our knowledge with outdated "postulates" that the Jews "came" from Israel. Drawing our attention to the "antiquity of opinion", as is known, is considered very effective by propagandists on the minds. According to the formula: it has always been like this, why are you, children, kicking up a fuss, why are you “climbing ahead of your father into hell”. And Renan, in turn, did not miss the opportunity to mention all the books “about Jews” that were available at the end of the century before last. He retold them all, and as a result, such a taiga was created, through the windfall of which it is impossible to get to the truth. It seems to me that this windfall was created by him specifically so that we would believe his main postulate, completely unproven, that the Jews “came” from the vicinity of Jerusalem.

Postulates

A postulate is something that is obvious and does not require proof. But this "obviousness" is often imaginary, like the convergence of heaven and earth on the horizon. It is not for nothing that brainless advertisers still repeat after Euclid that "parallel lines do not intersect”. Although this "imaginary" has been proven for a hundred years. Almost any science begins with postulates, but in the so-called exact sciences they are approached very carefully, so as not to make a mistake if possible. In "inexact" sciences, such as history, "postulates" can be taken straight out of thin air, without even thinking about any possible mistakes, according to Griboyedov: "Signed, and off your shoulders - off”.

For example: "The Aryans and Semites declare their existence to the world... The center of settlement of the Aryan race 2000 years before the birth of Christ was ancient Aria (present-day Afghanistan); From here it spread to the east and north the branches from which subsequently came the Celts, the Scythians (Germans and Slavs), the Pelasgians (Greeks and Italics). The center of the Semitic race at this time was Arabia... From Arabia... came the **conquerors** who converted Babylonia... into a Semitic country. ... from Arabia also came those peoples who, having come to the Mediterranean basin, called themselves Canaanites; the Greeks called them Phoenicians. They spoke a language very similar to that which we call Hebrew. There is nothing to indicate that the Canaanites were ever nomads. From the very beginning they took over trade and navigation; they founded powerful commercial and industrial cities - Sidon, Arad, and the purely priestly city of Gebal (Byblos). Although they did not succeed in creating a real continental empire, nevertheless, Canaanite tribes lived in the interior of the country; they populated the whole of Palestine, especially to the east of the Jordan. Thus, Syria became a country of the Semitic type”.

That is all the nonsense from which, as from "parallel lines never intersect”, world history is built, and in general almost all the "descriptive sciences”, excluding zoology. And immediately there comes that aforementioned taiga windfall, through which it is impossible to get through, and based on the four "whales" mentioned in the introduction. Do I need to repeat again what I stated above, criticizing the "whales"? Is it necessary to say such nonsense with an important look that the first half of the peoples of Eurasia "descended" from the Aryan-Afghans, and the second - from the Semites? The English, Danes, Swedes, Germans, not counting the Russians, Italians and Greeks are Afghans. All of Arabia and Asia Minor, including Persia - Semites. Where did the Semites border on the Aryans? After all, such wars must be waged on this border that the Apocalypse will seem like "Chinese ceremonies" of politeness. And how did the Aryans jump so deftly that they jumped over the Semites, jumping all the way to the English Channel, and then to the islands? And why did the Semites conquer (I emphasized this word for a reason) all the countries, did they have an atomic bomb? I even have a special section about Gebal in other works, it is

simply an idiotic invention. In general, it would be better to return to the introduction, my tongue is tired. Although, I will give another quote: "During the stay (of the Semitic nomads) in one place, sometimes lasting for several years, people managed to sow grain, plant vineyards". It is hard to believe that Renan is a Frenchman, who should know better than me that a vineyard left without care for a year will already be a taiga windfall, which I mentioned above, and the harvest from a newly planted vineyard must be expected for at least five years. And a field not sown with wheat will be overgrown with bushes in a year or two. And growing bread is a great art, achieved not so much by lifelong learning as at the genetic level. And nomads cannot "stay" in one place not only for several years, but even for several months, all the grass along with the roots will be trampled by cattle. Renan simply wants to lead the nomads to a settled life, but he does not know how to do this. He does not realize that even today's Kazakhs, Kalmyks, and northern peoples cannot stop for three years to feel the delights of a settled life.

The plural in the singular

"Like all ancient peoples", writes Renan, "the nomadic Semites were convinced that they lived in the midst of supernatural forces. The world is surrounded, penetrated and ruled by Elohim (gods), myriads of active beings, very similar to the "spirits" of savages... Meanwhile, among the Semites, a single eloh (god) does not have a name that would distinguish it from another, so that all the eloh act together as one being, and the word elohim (plural) is combined with a verb in the singular" (p. 28). Meanwhile, Renan, a few pages earlier, praising the Aryan language for the high development of verbal conjugations, adds: "In the Semitic language, on the contrary, an extreme poverty of verbal forms is noticeable from the very beginning" (p. 21). Does he think that no one will notice or compare his efforts to reduce "the plural to the singular", for which there is no possibility in the "verb forms of the Semites"? And besides, I have already written that the number of decipherers of ancient texts is the same number of deciphering options. And I will once again note the "windfall" of the book, through which one must wade.

Why does Renan need all this? And he has no other way to explain the origin of monotheism. It is not for nothing that he titles the next chapter IV: "Monotheism. – The Absence of Mythology". And he begins it by saying that the origin of monotheism has been proven, it only needs to be slightly distinguished from "Greek" mythology. Why? Yes, so that you do not think, God forbid, that the "Greeks" are still Jews. Or rather, the smartest and most literate Jewish part, combing through and exploiting the local peoples who have never been "Greeks". But no people, no tribe could do without mythology, read Frazer. So, without wanting to, Renan proved to us that "Greek" mythology is essentially Jewish mythology, based on those same "elokhs" when they were not yet singular. The rest is a matter of falsification techniques, to which I devoted a special chapter in the book mentioned and other works. Nevertheless, Renan exclaims: "This God, who arose from a mixture of nameless gods, becomes the absolute God..". Cleverly, but not very cleverly, the reason is trivial, it should not even be discussed. It is better to turn to the urgent need of disparate traders to identify themselves, and from afar to unite in love for sugar, vodka, drugs, women, boys, and so on. But Yahweh unites everyone, both the lovers just listed, and in general all imaginable. That's the point!

Babylonian "teachers" of the Jews

"The Semitic shepherds who wandered through these countries listened to everything. Everything made a strong impression on them... This stay left deep traces on them" (pp. 40-43). Where were they wandering that everything "made a strong impression on them", as if it were the "Chukchi" from the joke who had

come to Moscow for the first time? - according to "Ancient Babylon", approximately according to Renan, differing in scientific, technical and cultural progress from the "Semitic shepherds" in the same way as Moscow and the Chukchi camp. But how did it happen then that "the dominant language in Babylonia from **ancient times** (my emphasis) was the Semitic dialect, called "Assyrian"? It's the same as if the "Chukchi" from the joke came to Moscow, and there everyone without exception spoke Chukchi, and "for a long time". True, with an accent, so that our Chukchi "barely understood" them, poor thing (p. 40).

Besides, Renan hardly did not know that "Ancient Babylonia", according to traditional history, was one big grain field, divided by no less ancient "Aryks", into which water from the river was scooped up and poured by buckets on a wheel, turned by the river flow. Can you imagine "nomads" with their herds on this continuous cultural field? Even if they migrated "to learn their language" and other benefits of civilization.

And note that in Renan this happens at the very dawn of centuries, though not specified by figures, but only by the saying: "Babylon had already been a beacon for several centuries, shining even brighter than Egypt, in the midst of that deep night". A poet, you can't argue with that! What would you say if a modern poet began to describe with approximately the same enthusiasm a cat crushed by a car on the road or carrion under a fence? But I got angry and digressed. The fact is that the famous "Babylonian captivity of the Jews", for which you may have taken this "teaching" from Renan, will be only 500 pages later, at the very end of the book, and I, as you see, am on page 40 of this gigantic work. So, the "Babylonian captivity", during which either the Jews had already begun to teach the Babylonians, or they themselves continued to learn (I have not finished reading it yet), is not only 500 pages away, but also several thousand years from the events described. And please do not forget that the Babylonians are already babbling in Hebrew.

And if you do not accept my version of the development of events, then I will not be offended at all.

Why did the Jews call their god Yahweh?

"... there was perhaps one more borrowing from primitive or so-called "Akkadian" Assyria, a borrowing of the first importance, namely: the very name Iahoue or Iahve. <...> This impressive name, apparently, was imprinted on the minds of the Semitic shepherds, and they were accustomed to look at Iahoua as a synonym for El or Elohim". But then Renan remembered what he had said above, that if the Jews have always had one god, then there is no need to give him a proper name. In extreme cases, one can say: God the Father, without a name and patronymic, and, especially, without a surname. And if the god does have a name, although he has become one, then this name was needed in order to distinguish this god from all the others. Therefore Renan again carried on nonsense, I will quote it, perhaps you will understand: "We hasten, however, to note that in this area there still remain great doubts. We will later be convinced of the complete acceptability of the opinion that Yahweh is a local deity of Sinai or a regional god of Palestine. (How is this so, when did they take this name in Babylonia? - Mine). Among other dark problems of ancient history, this problem is one of the most hopeless. The names Yahweh or Kamose, which the Syro-Arab peoples gave to their supreme deities, seem to us an insoluble riddle. We believe that patriarchal elohim should be considered as preceding Yahwehism, Kamoseism, etc., and standing much higher than them. It was an enormous advantage that the god previously bore only one generic name, excluding any idea of personality. We may consider it an advance to think that all the "Elohim", united in the person of one Elohim, act as one being; but we see signs of decay in the gods acquiring proper names, Kamose, Yahweh, Rimmon, and for each people a separate deity, jealous, selfish, and concerned with his own interests, is

created. The one people of Israel was destined in time to correct the defects of the national god, and to destroy his proper name by making it synonymous with the common name Elohim".

I understand that you will not reread this Jesuit opus as many times as I have, I actually did not quote it for that purpose, but to continue the quote that immediately follows the one quoted: "**The story of this slow process of transformation, which returned the people to the primitive patriarchal state, will form the main content of this book**" (p. 45, highlighted by me).

That is, Renan, in addition to using the "sacred cows" or "whales" of history described in the introduction, wants to convince society that at first there was no matriarchy, patriarchy immediately appeared, then it was somewhat forgotten in "ancient" Greece and Rome, and slowly but surely they began to "return to the primitive patriarchal state". In the book I mentioned, I have one hundred percent proven that up until the "renaissance" organized by Cosimo de' Medici on the basis of the World Bank, at least in the Mediterranean, matriarchy reigned, and the first gods were all "mother goddesses", for whom male gods were simple doormats, something like "handsome call boys".

Actually, Renan himself writes on the same quoted page 45: "... the name Iahou or Iahve could be used as a name for God. The root hawa, written with a hard or soft h, means "being", breeze, life in Aramaic and is partly analogous to the word rouah. The mother of the living, the first woman, was called Hawwa (Eve); the ruler of life, the supreme being could be called Iahwa". Isn't this additional evidence in favor of the mother goddess Eve? And no one except the Jews, since this is a Jewish name, older than which there is no name on Earth, could "turn" this name into a male name. Moreover, as I wrote above, the other peoples, not disunited by trade, simply had no need for this. It was not for nothing that I said that one should not neglect simple common sense, but, on the contrary, one should rely on it.

Opposite Predilections

Renan wants the Jews to "roam" only in Palestine, sometimes escaping to Babylonia, Syria, and so on, and that is why he writes: "They probably had the same aversion to the sea as the Arabs: the sea was considered some kind of sad element of destruction in a certain part of the universe. These tribes, which were initially trans-Euphrates, became pre-Euphrates with the crossing of the river. They bore the common generic name of Jews (Jbrim, - those who came from the other side)" (p. 47). I can't explain this brazenly invented dislike of the Jews for the sea in any other way than Renan's desire to show us the banks of the Euphrates instead of the shores of the sea, which even a cat can swim across without any problem. How is that possible? Yahweh would stop the seas (Chermnoye, that is, the Red Sea), the Jordan (Bosphorus, because a chicken can wade across the Jordan River) with a wall every now and then, and then "close the waters" to drown the enemies. And in general, the ancient Jews worshiped the god of water Ridia ("Tsoma", 21a). By the way, one more Jewish god was found, besides Elohim in the "singular-plural" number!

And already on page 60 he writes: "The invasion of the Semites into the Mediterranean coastline soon made itself felt in Egypt". But you must understand Renan. How could he deliver the Jews into "Egyptian captivity"?

Egypt

Can you imagine for what the hell the Jews went to Egypt? If Renan writes on page 62: "One thing is certain: the Israelites entered Egypt under the rule of a dynasty favored by the Semites, and left there under a hostile dynasty". I am not even talking about the fact that with the same unknown purpose they "entered"

Babylon to pasture their flocks in the wheat fields, Syria for a walk, and so on. Doesn't it seem to you that it was only for the sake of fulfilling the passion of historians for the "migration of peoples"? And how did they know that some Egyptian dynasty would be "favored by them"? If you and I know very well that not only each new king of a dynasty, but even the same king changes his "predilections" even to his personal favorites almost every day. It is sheer madness to write history like that. And can you imagine that, for example, the Americans, when changing not even a dynasty, but only a president, would suddenly consider the Chinese or Japanese who moved to them at the beginning of the century, or those same Jews, of whom there are countless, as prisoners? Ah, in the ancient world people were fools. But not such that assimilated "foreigners", who are indistinguishable from their own Egyptians, would suddenly be "considered prisoners". After all, passports had not yet been invented, nor Jewish ghettos.

And do not consider, if you are sane, as the reason for the migration the fact that “having settled in the country of Goshen, the Israelites, without a doubt, arranged for themselves such an “ark” (Egyptian – mine), and the place where it was located was the center of the mixed cult that they professed. Having left the country (Egypt – mine), they probably took the ark with them. This ark was most adapted to nomadic life; it accompanied the Israelites in all their wanderings across the Sinai Peninsula. We will see how it subsequently acquired extraordinary significance and became the cradle of all the religious institutions of the Israelites. **The boat, which was a necessary accessory to the tabernacle** (emphasis is mine) in Egypt, disappeared in this new use, and there remained something like a large box, equipped with sticks for carrying in the hands…” (p. 64).

Here Renan was caught again. A little above the quoted phrase he writes: "...they (the Jews) adopted from their neighbors (the Egyptians) the custom of arranging arks or "tabernacles" where the image of God, inaccessible to the eyes of the laity, was hidden behind the wings of birds, which covered the face of the deity from the front and sides. In the Egyptian ritual, such a small closed chapel was always placed on a stretcher in the form of a boat, which the priests carried on their shoulders during the processions or wanderings of the deity”.

Firstly, "the boat, which was a necessary accessory to the tabernacle" is at the same time the tabernacle itself, since in the second quote it is written: "arks or tabernacles”. A boat and an ark are one and the same, and according to the Bible itself, an ark is even more likely a sea vessel on which Noah and the chosen "creatures in pairs" were saved. Secondly, it was not the Jews who invented the “sticks for carrying on the hands”, but the Egyptians “always placed a small closed chapel on a stretcher shaped like a boat, which the priests carried on their shoulders”. Thirdly, this is not the point, although it is funny, but the fact that there was no need to “invade the Mediterranean coastline” just to go on foot to Egypt and find out about boats, excuse me, tabernacles. Not to mention “equipping the boat with sticks for carrying on the hands”.

From all this nonsense, one can only draw one conclusion, that the Jews have long been familiar with the sea, sea arks (ships), as I have already written about this twice, in the introduction and a little higher. And then there would be no need to invent about the "Jews' aversion to the sea”. But the sea, moreover the Chermnoe Sea (Red Sea), of which there can only be one in nature due to the red algae that live there, "opens up to let the Jews pass by dry land, then closes up to drown their enemies”. It is not for nothing that Renan says nothing about this in this case. And the Red Sea, meanwhile, adjoins Yemen, if modern maps do not lie. Moreover, in that place it is very narrow, and the neck is filled with islands like a barrel of herrings. And it is much easier for the Jews to get to Egypt through Ethiopia and the Blue Nile than to walk through the Sinai Desert, where water is as rare as hen's teeth. And that's not all. If you remember, Egypt was once

ruled by Ethiopians, although historians speak of this through clenched teeth and completely inarticulately, and most importantly - without details. Add to this that the Ethiopians are still largely Jews, many of them were even invited to live in present-day Israel. And know that in Ethiopia there is an Amharic language, which is not spoken by Jews, but by those very Ethiopians whom the Jews contemptuously called "Amhaars" in the Bible, that is, workers of the land, farmers, despised slaves, "whose services the Jews must use forever". And, for example, in Russia, it is harder to find a Jew on a collective farm than a needle in a haystack. If you don't believe me, read Solzhenitsyn, he proved with the tsar's decrees in hand that the Jews, even in the warmest Russian regions, had been taught to work the land for 200 years, but they still hadn't. Because for a Jew, working the land is the most shameful thing. Or are you going to attach too much importance to the absence of a double "a" in the Amharic language?

Having given the Jews an "ark", for which they had come to Egypt specifically, the Egyptians took revenge on the Jews by creating for them a "class of clergy, undoubtedly of Egyptian origin, which each (Jewish) family fed in exchange for services in the field of worship. These were the people who later received the name levi... It is possible that this term appeared later, when the "Levites" formed a special landless tribe, and when it became common to believe that Levi was the son of Jacob, who did not receive an inheritance under his father's will, and that his descendants should live scattered among the other tribes and receive food from them" (p. 65).

On the same page, Renan, contradicting himself, adds: "It is important, in any case, to note that levi is not at all a patriarchal cohen (priest). Every head of a family is a cohen. Among many pious tribes, the chief was called cohen, and noble people - cohanim. These titles were treated with deep respect. The Levite was only a priest who oversaw the external side of the cult".

So that there is no doubt, I will "translate" this gibberish. In "Palestine" the father, even if all his children are married, is both the secular head of the family and the priest of the family, and under the same name - cohen. Then this idiotic double title passed from the father of the family to a group of families. This main cohen of all the available cohens and his "main family" became cohanim, highly respected for this. From respect the cohanim became lazy, or tired of double work, since it is necessary to look after order not only in the house, but also in the community, and also to replace the priestly duties not only in his own house, but in the entire community. Then the main Jew got cunning, and invented the legend about Levi, about the unfair will, and so on (see above). But what do the Egyptians have to do with it? And despite the fact that in "Palestine" the Jews, according to Renan, did not have Levites, pure priests, they went to Egypt for them, allegedly stealing the "ark" there at the same time.

I have the following explanation here, which puts everything in its place based on elementary logic. However, you should understand it yourself if you read the introduction and "about the ark". But I will explain it anyway. Remember how the Jews moved from the "First Law" to Deuteronomy, which divided religion and jurisprudence in the form of "flies and soup - separately"? This is what gave impetus to the formation of the clergy, which devoted itself entirely to serving Yahweh, and the fathers of the family (cohanim) concentrated on jurisprudence, that is, on moral aspects. That's all, and no need for idiotic inventions "about the guilt of the Egyptians". In addition, this proves as clear as day that the Jews got to "Palestine" later than to Egypt, as I just wrote. And not only through Egypt, but also through the Persian Gulf and Mesopotamia. There, the two normal tribes I wrote about above could have met, and even without even knowing each other.

Now I will briefly mention the Khazar kogans (khagans), rabbis (teachers, the same as priests) and Jewish communities - kahals in Poland and Russia. I will talk about this in more detail below, when I will consider Koestler's work on the Khazar Khaganate.

But for now I will dwell on what the hell the Jews didn't like about Egypt? Renan writes: "The Egyptian civilization, whose history is so reminiscent of the history of China, had the peculiarity that after the capture of the country by foreigners, it absorbed the conqueror and, in the end, restored the disturbed balance. <…> From a conquered country, Egypt turned into a conquering country. <…> Having achieved victory through persistence, the Egyptian treated the Semites of Egypt and Syria as the Chinese ruler treats the rebellious barbarians. <…>The Israelites lost all their privileges…, they fell into poverty…, they were forced to become workers and offer their labor for the most brutal jobs".

I have cited these key words, partially freeing them from poetic garbage, in order to more clearly indicate what Renan puts at the forefront. Firstly, as it turns out, the Jews did conquer Egypt. And on this issue, I want to say right away that this is impossible. Such a Palestinian "little thing" could not conquer a vast country, because they did not have American tanks and planes at that time. The Jewish foot army would have all perished in the Sinai desert from thirst. I have already spoken about wars in general in the introduction; they simply need to be thrown out of history like candy wrappers.

Secondly, as recent history, which can be trusted, says, "absorption of the conqueror" is complete nonsense. Even if it is a "conqueror" without weapons in his hands, ideological, technological or commercial. Thirdly, it would be interesting to know how this "conqueror" turns into a "rebellious barbarian"? It would be even more interesting to know how this rather idiotic metamorphosis turns "rebellious barbarians" into people with "privileges"? And suddenly, like a blow to the head, transforms "privileges" into "poverty". This chain reminds me of the chain of chemical reactions of an alchemist in order to turn shit into gold.

Fourthly, gentlemen! Where on the globe have you seen a mass transition of Jews to blue-collar jobs, and in the "most crude jobs" at that? This is sheer nonsense!

And if all the points considered are complete nonsense, then let's accept my concept about the maximum percentage of traders to the total population, which I spoke about in the introduction. And everything will immediately become clear, consistently logically explained. I have already said where the Jews came to Egypt from. They created good trade here, introduced alphabetic writing in parallel with Egyptian hieroglyphs, became especially respected people among the rulers, since the rulers like to borrow money from the Jews, though mostly without return. And here is the conflict. But this is one side of the coin. The other side lies, as I have already said, in saturation, the saturation of the common people with traders. So the Jews went on to "comb" the nations, and finally got to both Gibraltar and the Bosphorus. I have details in other works. Here I will finish by saying that the Bible is right about the "exodus from Egypt". Only this must be understood as an exodus of excess Jews, and not for the reason that historians talk about.

Foreskin

I would not have touched upon this topic if I had not proved that the primary deity on Earth is a woman. I think I have proven this logically enough in my other works, but I could not resist emphasizing it here, especially since I do not have much evidence of the transformation of mother goddesses into male gods, and very late, almost on the eve of our days, or to be more precise, in the Renaissance.

Renan writes, quoting the Bible and continuing on his own behalf: "…Yahweh attacked Moses and wanted to kill him. And Zipporah took a flint, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and threw it at the feet of **her husband**, and said: you are a man of blood to me. Then Yahweh let Moses go". This episode obviously corresponds to the story of Jacob's struggle with one of the Elohim. (Remember polytheism in one person? - Mine). When a person passed through lands belonging to some god, the latter often attacked him at night. The person often emerged from the struggle castrated, weakened, or saved himself by bloody atonement".

Of course, it is idiotic to explain it this way. And Renan knew this very well. It is modern people, even the linguist Ozhegov, who confuse castration with circumcision. Castration is the complete removal of the sexual organ, which occurred mainly on the festival of the main mother goddess, and was practiced in an era of acute shortage of women. Circumcision is, perhaps, an imitation of castration, which became a religious ritual. But it may also be a preventive measure in hot countries among nomads in conditions of water shortage. It is not for nothing that circumcision existed even among the Australian aborigines, who had nothing to do with the three main religions of the Earth. Details in my other works.

Therefore, Yagweh (I am used to writing Yahweh) most likely did not want to kill Moses, but to castrate him, seeing that Tzipora, his, God's first wife, dared to have an heir from some Moses. This is, in my opinion, the conflict. In Renan, Tzipora throws her son's foreskin at the feet of Moses, which is the second extreme nonsense, since it turns out to be an unsolvable riddle. Like: a long green one hangs in the living room and squeaks, to which the answer should be: herring. Why green? - Painted. Why hangs in the living room? - Hung. Why squeaks? - To make it harder to guess.

Meanwhile, other researchers claim that it was Yahweh who threw Tzipora's son's foreskin at the feet, thereby showing him that it was he, Yahweh, who was "a man of blood for her", and Moses was just an uncle from the road. But then it turns out that the main god on Earth is not a man, but a woman. Which I never tire of repeating. And Renan, as I reported a little above, set the main goal of his thick book as "a return to ancient patriarchal life". So he lies shamelessly, since the text he quotes cannot be passed over in silence when talking about Moses. For this text is very famous, remained in the Bible due to an oversight before its canonization, and hundreds, if not thousands, of the heads of the most famous researchers have been broken on it.

But all the historians I know, without exception, also write that "matriarchy was on the verge of the early and late Paleolithic", that is, 20 – 30 thousand years ago, when there were no Jews on Earth at all. But I say that matriarchy in Western Europe was still at the beginning of the Renaissance. That is why this example is fundamentally important to me. I have details about this in the book I mentioned and other works.

Warrior Jews

From the "Exodus from Egypt", for 700 pages, Renan's Jews are all at war. I will not dwell on this at all, since it is primitive, and I have already spoken about this. I will only give a quote that shows the pitifulness of the following Renanian concept: "These military successes of the Israelites seem inexplicable to us at first glance. Neither in the patriarchal era, nor during their stay in Egypt did the Israelites develop military habits. In the era of the Judges, they often turn out to be weaker than their neighbors. Later (if we exclude the eras of Saul and David) the Israelite also does not show a calling for a warrior. There is an assumption that the military superiority of this group of Egyptian fugitives over the tribes of the Jordan region is explained by the presence of Egyptians among this group…"

Renan, of course, did not live to see the “seven-day” war on the Sinai Peninsula, but modern Israelis routed their “teachers” utterly. That is, although the Israelites had never fought, it made no sense for them to borrow their military power from the Egyptians with the help of Renan. I say that the Jews are not warriors, but natural traders.

Jews in the “homeland”, on the banks of the Jordan

The fact that the Jews from their very beginning as traders lived among other peoples is confirmed by the following quote, if we understand it correctly, and not as Renan wants. "The Israelis, having finally established themselves on their territory (on the Jordan - mine), nevertheless preserved in practice the habits of a nomadic life. The family was the only established group. The characteristic feature of a nomadic, or former nomadic, population is hatred of the central authority. Not only did the entire Israeli nation as a whole not submit to the federal government - each tribe was in a state of peculiar anarchy, reminiscent of the state of today's Arab tribes, where the only sufficient guarantee of personal or property security, given the scarcity of public-law guarantees, is the solidarity of the members of a given tribal group" (p. 114).

In general, Renan writes correctly, only the source of this phenomenon is in the wrong place. It is enough to read Solzhenitsyn's last book to understand that the Jews in Russia never submitted to the federal authority either, and did so so cleverly that the tsarist government was knocked off its feet for 200 years, but could do nothing about it. The same thing happens in Soviet times, and in the post-Soviet era. Suffice it to say, that the Soviet uncles in the Kremlin quietly decided not to allow Jews into universities, and the majority of Jews still had higher education.

Now let's take a look at the modern Arabs in the Middle East. Normal law-abiding citizens live there, and they have no trace of "hatred of the central government”.

But the "solidarity of members of this clan group", not nomads, but Jewish traders, piercers, "combs" of peoples, is correctly noted. But this is not a consequence of a nomadic way of life, since the Jews stopped wandering immediately after they went down to the sea, and now they do not wander, but only disperse due to crowding. But this is a completely different matter. And once again confirms my version of the historical process.

The Jews had not yet managed to move to the Jordan, and this is the most ancient part of history, when women's names began to shine, however, also known from Egypt: "At that time there lived a prophetess named Deborah, who performed the duties of a judge among the people of Israel”. All I can exclaim is: glory to the orthodox of the Bible, who did not allow her to be removed from history. Because a judge is a king in the "era of judges”. But Renan insists: “Among the patriarchal tribes, women did not occupy the position they had to occupy later, when the harem life that arose under Solomon contributed to the decline of morals”. But, firstly, Solomon is a woman, even in the first centuries of Christianity she was depicted as a woman everywhere (see the illustrations in the works of Nosovsky and Fomenko). So her harem was most likely male. I just don’t know what to call it. Secondly. What “patriarchal tribes”, what “decline in morals” can Renan talk about, when the “fairytale” history of the Jews has only just begun? And they are immediately ruled by women, who subsequently could not be erased. For the Roman Empire, which “destroyed” Jerusalem, “will arise” only in several thousand years, and now “historians” are not even planning for it. Thirdly, I have already said that from the time of Deuteronomy, the Jews needed both priests and judges. So the "era of judges" cannot be placed after the "era of kings" or vice versa, these eras

must be combined. But historians have separated them and sent them one after the other, "to make it harder to guess".

I will note that I have not outlined my research on matriarchy and patriarchy here, so I refer the reader to my book mentioned above. In the meantime, I will continue the quote: "**The imaginary** (emphasis is mine) sister of Moses, Miriam, plays an outstanding **role in the legend of the exodus from Egypt, the full significance of which we cannot yet comprehend in the current state of the biblical texts**. We meet women at that time who were quite independent, who freely managed their property, chose their own husbands, and participated in all areas of male activity…"

I, of course, understand that Renan did not write this so that I would doubt his "patriarchal antiquity", he had already explained to me that "morals had deteriorated". He wrote this in order to add: "We see something similar among the ancient Arabs". And he needs this, in turn, to deduce from this only the secondary nature of Islam, which I do not object to. But I also know that in the Koran, the "supposed sister of Moses" is characterized as follows: "Oh, Maryam, you have done an unheard-of thing! Oh, sister of Harun…" (Surah 19/28 – 29). Harun is Aaron, the brother of Moses (according to the Koran – Musa), his high priest. And so that you have no doubts about Mariam, I quote the Quran further: "And the angels said: "Oh, Mariam! Behold, Allah gives you glad tidings of a word from Him, whose name is Messiah Isa, son of Mariam, renowned in this world and the Hereafter, and one of those brought near" (Surah 3/40). Isa is Jesus, everyone knows that. Why did she suddenly become "imaginary" in Renan? Why did it turn out that her role, "the full meaning of which we cannot yet comprehend"?

What "unheard of" did Mariam, who sounds in the Quran in Russian as Maryam, do? What do you mean? She gave birth to Christ. From whom? From God, of course. But — immaculately. And here, of course, Deborah, Tzipora, the foreskin thrown at the feet of a god named Yahweh (Yagweh in Renan) come to mind. And Moses, standing before Yahweh as if spat upon, almost beaten. So who was the most important among the Jews at that time? Deborah-Tzipora-Maryam or Moses? No need to answer. I will only add that in my book mentioned there is a chapter. It is called "Gods and Incest". There is a complete collection of materials on this issue, with drawings.

About the "Israelite tribes"

In general, I don't care about these 12 or 13 tribes, I know that at first there were only two. But Renan should know that if he succeeded in creating a Jewish sedentary kingdom-state near the small river Jordan, then the "tribes" should be together, side by side. Meanwhile, he writes: "As we have seen, none of the wars that have just been described (I do not comment on wars) had - national significance; not a single hegemony won by any tribe extended to the entire Israeli people. The Josephites sometimes acted together with the northern tribes. Gilead was a special separate world. The tribe of Judah almost never entered into an alliance with others; the Book of Judges says very little about it; it was almost excluded from the general list of the tribes of Israel. <…> Thus, for two or three centuries, the isolated life of twelve family groups continued, undoubtedly related to each other and clearly aware of their kinship, but rarely united for common actions".

Renan wrote this as an introduction to a discussion of the liturgical subtleties of faith, which I also do not care about, but this is a direct first-hand illustration proving my concept. That is why I cited the passage. Moreover, here Renan himself proved not only that there were no wars in reality, but also that the tribes, supposedly closed in an overcrowded train (look at the map of Israel!), did not communicate. But can the

teeth of a comb, being in thick hair, close "for common actions", for example, as a knife? The main thing is that this is the most ancient history of the Jews, and "Solomon" was not even born, and they were already scattered among the nations. Is this not proof of my version?

**Solomonia-Solomeya cannot be removed, therefore she is Solomon**

The reader, I hope, will understand, after reading the title, the subtlety and caution with which Renan creeps up on this slippery topic: "The consequence of Eastern polygamy is the predominant role of the mother in the family, and in royal families - the dominant influence of the queen ..."

If I had not come up with such a title, then you would probably have ignored this introductory phrase. But with this phrase he smooths over your surprise: why the hell is the parade of Jews commanded by one of the hundreds of wives of the former king, the mother of the current king, and not the king himself? After all, "Solomon" himself will have over 700 such wives, not counting concubines. Renan either did not think it through properly, or was too lazy to think, but the phrase he quoted turned out to be illogical, purely distracting, like wagging a finger at your nose. After all, it is more logical to simply write: the mother's dominant role appeared, without explanation. Or maybe he specifically did not specify what kind of polygamy he was talking about: polyandry or polygyny? So that you would get confused. Polygamy and polygyny are almost the same sound. In any case, if there are many wives, then logically you will not get the "dominant influence of queens". In this regard, I want to say that when forging documents, it is desirable to choose an option so that you have to forge as few words and letters as possible. And I am convinced that in the Bible about "Solomon" - a forgery. Of course, you can completely remove Solomon the woman, but then there will be no history of the Jews.

I continue quoting, skipping a little of the insignificant: “This power-hungry woman (allegedly Bethsheba is Solomon’s mother, and beth, as is known, is house in Hebrew) really took a prominent place in the new kingdom. Her son (Solomon) wanted to accept the crown from her hands. When she entered, King Solomon rose, walked towards her, bowed before her and ordered that a similar throne be placed on the right side of the throne for her. Bethsheba, who, according to some legends, was originally married to a Hittite (Hittites, remember?) and had almost no Israeli blood in her veins, **was able to inspire Solomon with a very moderate zeal for the cult of Yagweh. Women in general would prove themselves to be rather weak Yagwehists in this era. Yagwehism was, like Islamism, exclusively a religion of men**” (emphasis is mine).

I immediately ask: why the hell should female queens in a matriarchy show “zeal” for male gods? For such “zeal” they have the main mother goddess, whom they “represent” on earth. Read my book about how the main mother goddess Aphrodite mocked her husband, the blacksmith god Hephaestus, how she constantly made cuckolds with him with anyone she could get her hands on. Or the goddess-progenitor and progenitor goddess Gaia, who completely stopped fulfilling her marital duties to the god Uranus (her son), preferring her other son Kronos (Cronus), who eventually got tired of his mother’s annoying husband and took him and castrated him. This is what matriarchy is even in later times, already among the “Greeks” and “Romans”. And Renan talks about the dawn of Judaism, several thousand years earlier. The quotation marks are because the ancient Greeks are late Jews, and there were no ancient Romans at all.

Therefore, the highlighted text seems to me to be sheer hypocrisy. Of all people, it is Renan who should know all this. But he has a task, set by himself: to "return" us to patriarchal mores. As if he does not know that he should not turn around, if he has already started talking about patriarchy, but direct us straight to the Renaissance, that is, forward on the timeline. There we would have met the just emerging patriarchy.

Solomonia was not only turned into a man, but also moved closer to us

Here is another example of female peacefulness: "a characteristic feature of Solomon's reign was peacefulness". A small phrase, but a powerful one. Women, as a rule, with the exception of Margaret Thatcher, do not start wars.

I don't like the name Solomonia myself, she is probably just Solomeya, there was such a queen too. Oh well, I will call her in Renan's style – Solomon. "Solomon, for entirely reasonable reasons, constantly turned his gaze to the Red Sea, a wide channel, thanks to which the beginnings of the civilization that developed on the Mediterranean coast could be transferred to India. There a new world was opening up, the world of Ophir".

Then follows a footnote by the author, explaining what Ophir is. In my opinion, in terms of the meaning embedded in it, it is more important than the main text: "The hypothesis of Lassen, identifying "Ophir" with India at the mouth of the Indus, was not only not shaken, but on the contrary, began to approach certainty. If the Hebrew texts place Ophir near Yemen and the Straits of Bab el Mandeb, this is **due to a mistake** common to ancient geography. **The maps** drawn from sailors' accounts are **essentially false**, since the sailor pays attention only to the ports and estimates the distance by the difficulty with which he gets from one port to another. A phenomenon such as the monsoons, for example, completely confuses the sailor in determining the true distance from the starting point to the destination. **He has slept all the time in between, and therefore takes ports five or six hundred leagues distant for being in the neighbourhood. In the first centuries of our era, Yemen was not called "India"** (Renan, Marc-Aurele, pp. 462-463). In the manifesto of a recent Magdi (Journal des Debats, February 19, 1884), Suez and Constantinople are considered as two close cities, on the ground that an African from Nubia went from Suez to Constantinople. Clysma and India were also once closely connected, so that now certain quarters of Suez seem to be a continuation of Madras and Calcutta. The starting points of the great voyages are connected, as it were, by an electric wire, at both ends of which the same processes of polarization take place".

I honestly don't know where to begin. So much nonsense and uselessness has been piled up here, just to hide from us that Solomon lives in Yemen, and not in "Palestine". Well, tell me, why does Renan need to call India by some idiotic word, Ophir? After all, Ofen (Buda in the word Budapest), oferta (offer to trade), Ofenia (Russian peddler), and so on – all relate to trade. So Ophir is not India at all, but something connected with trade. Besides, even in the Bible, India is a completely independent word, a completely independent state, which was not given to any of Noah's three sons. I quote: "And the east went to Shem: Persia, Bactria, even to India in length… Ham got the south: Egypt, Ethiopia, neighboring India, and the other Ethiopia, from which flows the Ethiopian Red River…" So, the border with India is precisely known, but not further into it. But "Ethiopia, neighboring India" is nothing other than Yemen, when it had not yet been cut like sausage into a series of seaside beaches, starting with Aden, for at one time it was still part of Yemen.

Secondly, who could have told Renan that "the Jewish texts that bring Ophir closer to Yemen" are a delusion? Could it not be Yahweh himself? So one can say anything without any evidence, even that the Earth is shaped like a suitcase or that Renan himself is an Ethiopian emperor. And if, for example, I claim that Jews come from Yemen, then I prove it in almost every work of mine, collecting all the evidence available to me. And here too. And how will the reader perceive a direct insult to sailors? Just think about it: as soon as they set sail, they immediately fell asleep, not knowing where they were sailing, they arrived,

looked at the calendar - 10 days had passed. And they thought that they had just turned that cape. Mr. Renan, only passengers sail like that, and then only if they are hopelessly drunk for 10 days in a row. And if "maps made by sailors are essentially false", then who made the first maps? Perhaps the draftsmen of the French Academy, of which Renan was a member? Or does Renan not know that in his time there were no spy satellites yet?

Thirdly, who told you, Mr. Renan, that "in the first centuries of our era" India was identified with Yemen, why do you contradict it so much? I just quoted the Bible, which is the oldest, and even in it Yemen is not identified with India. On the contrary, one can understand that "Ethiopia, neighboring India" is Yemen, since there is nothing else on the map in this place. And you even make a reference to yourself on this matter, I will repeat it: Renan, Marc-Aurele, pp. 462-463. By the way, I have "Marcus Aurelius", but it ends on page 347, in a Russian translation from the beginning of the century before last, though.

I will not comment on the joke about the Nubian, it is very flat, but I will continue the quote, right from the place from which your footnote distracted me. "The Bay of Suez belonged to Egypt; but it was also possible to occupy the Gulf of Aqaba. Elath and Asiongaber, **judging by all indications**, were not of great importance in former times. **Without caring about the correct occupation of the country**, Solomon tried to secure a route for himself through the Arab Valley. He built a fleet for himself in **Asiongaber**. (Even in the Dictionary of Antiquity there is no mention of it, probably - Aqaba is Mine). <…> Hiram sent sailors to Solomon, or, what is more likely, both fleets (Israeli and Tyrian) sailed together".

Here is another footnote, but first I will comment on what I have rewritten. When a person writes "judging by all the signs", then as an honest person he should indicate them, or send for them to the exact address. But when a person writes these words just to pretend that he has these "signs", then he is a simple chatterbox. And what is "correct occupation of a country"? Or "incorrect"? Or in between? Again a chatterbox! But, lest you think that I am "picking at words", I must say that this is very important for history. So is it possible to create a fleet in Aqaba in one lifetime, having learned the words ship and fleet for the first time? Without having wood within the nearest 500-700, even 1000 kilometers. Without having craftsmen. Without having sailors. Without knowing navigation. Without knowing anything at all about the sea. Remember at least the "boat of Peter" - the highest achievement of the entire kingdom with a stop in Holland for several years, and at the tenth, hundredth turn of scientific and technological progress compared to the times of Solomon. Moreover, in solid forests of the best wood in the world, with craftsmen who "with one axe and chisel in their hands ..". in the words of Gogol could make almost the Tower of Babel. So, is it possible to build a fleet in Aqaba "to India" four or five thousand years ago in a waterless desert, where nothing grows except camel thorns? Even today, thousands of years later, Aqaba is a worthless town where desert phosphates are loaded onto ships. Therefore, I do not think that I am picking on words. These quibbles of mine are proof of either stupidity or a crime against history.

I understand Renan's "back" thought about "correct occupation". He knows that we know: these places where Solomon is building his fleet are not Israeli, but Egyptian. And you can't fight with Egypt, from which the Jews have just "left", for a place to build a fleet, there is no strength, they barely left. And if Yahweh had not "opened and closed the sea", then there would have been no one to build a fleet at all, the Jews would have been killed before Solomon. So he speaks figuratively, like the Egyptians do not need these lands, so the Israelites had no reason to worry about their "correct" occupation. From the same series is the baseless insertion "judging by all the signs", which must be understood: judging by all the signs, the Egyptians did not need these lands, where the Jews will build their fleet.

I cite the footnote that I mentioned above: “... the fleet is called “Hiram’s fleet”. Since Ophir (India) and Tarsis (Spain) were the outermost trading points for Tyre, they were sometimes confused, and the Red Sea fleet was more commonly called the "fleet of Tarsis"; thus, in our day, the name "transatlantic ship" or "peninsular ship" has become synonymous with the term "ship of the high coasts”. These abuses of words in ancient texts led the author of the Chronicles into a strange error”.

All this, of course, was cleverly invented by Renan. Although it is clear why the "transatlantic ship" is so called: large, strong, ocean-going, not like a coastal fishing boat. The peninsular Spain built exactly such ships to sail across the ocean to South America. As for the "high coasts”, this is most likely just a mistake in the Russian translation, and we should be talking about either high sides, or high latitudes, or distant countries. Or even about high berths for mooring.

Now let's talk about the "mixing" of a fork with a bottle, a famous organ with a finger, and so on. Hiram, if you believe the Bible, is a port in Lebanon. From Lebanon you can get to Spain, along the southern shore of the Mediterranean. You can get to Ethiopia along the Nile. From Ethiopia, it's a stone's throw to India. It's not for nothing that the Bible mentions "Ethiopia neighboring India" and "another Ethiopia, from which flows the Red River”. But Renan can't do this. His route across the Nile is cut off. "Having left" Egypt with such a scandal, the Jews cannot return there yet. There is no Suez Canal yet, Renan firmly remembers this, because this canal was built about 30 years before his death, in 1869. What to do? Solomon is here, standing on the shores of the Mediterranean, and he must be sent to India by sea. You can lose your head here. Renan did lose his. Together with conscience.

How many times have I warned historians in my works: say better: - I don’t know. Then other people will think about it too, and maybe they will find a solution to the riddle. It’s not “about green herring”, after all, it’s easier. But for some reason historians are all conceited or pre-programmed for nonsense. And since there is no Suez Canal, the Bible “confuses” or “mixes” India with Spain. No more, no less. But this is not enough, it is also necessary to create a fleet in the desert, which does not exist even today. But I have already said this. I will only add that even the Suez Canal did not really revive shipping on the Red Sea. Look at the map. On all its shores there is an uninhabited desert to this day. Only the port of Jeddah, especially for tourists to Mecca.

Against this background, my version flourishes. But I am already tired of writing about it.

Look how happy Renan was, having “overcome” insurmountable difficulties: “Having left the Strait of Aden, they (Solomon’s sailors – mine) headed for Ophir, i.e. to western India, to Guzarat or the coast of Malabar. <…> What items did the Tyrian and Israelite sailors bring from Ophir? Nothing essential, many luxury items. In Ophir, the Tyrian and Israelite sailors got a lot of gold, silver, precious stones, sandalwood, ivory, monkeys, peacocks. <…> What did the Semitic traders give Ophir in exchange for precious metals and other items, the market price of which was, apparently, not very high? We have no information about this. <…> …probably taken from the natives by force” (p. 204).

I already said that the historians' idea of trade is completely childish, if not stupid. Firstly, India of that time occupied no less a place in scientific, technical and cultural progress than Mesopotamia and Egypt, not to mention Israel with its rented sailors. Then the words "natives" and "take by force" are not appropriate. The Jews did not have Kalashnikovs to counter the wooden clubs of the "natives". Besides, there could not have been enough Jews to wage any kind of battle. And we need to get to the bottom of what they were "given in return". And if we do not get to the bottom of it, then there is no point in talking about trade. And

robbery, especially multiple robberies, is impossible, as I have already said. That is how I reasoned when I began to study the question of trade, no matter where. And I always found, in the end, an answer. There can be no one-off, occasional trade, it is a stationary process, otherwise there will be no process. And a stationary process can support itself if it is needed by the majority of people at the ends of this process. Using the example of the Great Passage Yard from the Bosphorus to the Pacific Ocean, I found this item of trade: salt. I firmly established that in the entire Far East, on the Pacific coast, from Indochina to Chukotka, there are no, and were not, its deposits available for development in prehistoric times. Just as there was no salt in Ancient Greece and Rome, nor in the Balkans, nor in other parts of Europe. There was salt only in Alexandria. But the Ethiopians were already laughed at for using potash instead of salt. And in Byzantium itself, all officials and soldiers were paid in salt. I also firmly established that in ancient Yemen there were developments of table rock salt. So, maybe it was also given "in exchange for luxury goods" in today's Pakistan, on the threshold of India? I don't know, this is beyond my interests. But everything that I “dug up” from Renan about Solomon gives me reason to assert that Solomon, at the time when Renan wrote about him, lived not in Palestine, but in Yemen or Ethiopia.

Solomon's Debts

Solomon built the famous Temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem. How funny it looks in Renan: "Large states require large funds. Israel had neither trade nor industry to cover its costs" (p. 218). Childish Renan has already forgotten that on page 204 he lists the Indian treasures "free" obtained by his hasty sailors. However, I will continue quoting: "Solomon had to take timber, craftsmen and workers from the Tyrians, who took advantage of the fact that they were in need. We have already seen (without you, gentlemen, I missed it) that Solomon was obliged to deliver grain bread and cattle to Hiram (find out where it grows in Israel today). Towards the end of the reign, it was necessary to begin alienating lands: Solomon was forced to cede to Hiram twenty Galilean cities, west of Lake Gule, in the region of Yaron and Maron. This was the so-called country of Kabul. (Isn't this Afghanistan?).

After this extract, I almost sent Renan's entire book out the window. Then I cooled down. After all, I paid 300 rubles. It's a pity. And I'm still on page 218 out of 800. But I won't comment on this nonsense.

Renan sent the Jews to Mesopotamia

A cloud of enemies with sabers and pikes flew in from all sides and the Jewish Jerusalem "fell" at last, though it outlived Israel by some centuries. This is how Renan put it: "Judaism, thus, found itself completely beheaded in Palestine. Jerusalem was just a pile of ruins. The villages retained most of their inhabitants. But these villages, thrown into disarray by Josiah's reforms, had no organized cult. Yagwehism was truly transplanted to other soil. It ended up entirely in Mesopotamia and Babylonia. The self-consciousness of the Israeli people was suppressed in Judea. In Babylonia, on the contrary, it received tenfold intensity”.

Why drive the Jews back and forth? They are tired of it. First Egypt, then Palestine, now they have driven them to Mesopotamia, then return them to Palestine again. And when Napoleon's corporals for some reason arrived in Palestine somewhere around 1800, they found only the village of El-Quds in place of Jerusalem, where they had never heard of Jerusalem. Let's talk about "a pile of ruins”. Berlin, Dresden, Warsaw, not to mention Minsk, Kyiv, Stalingrad, were a pile of ruins after World War II? Moreover, these ruins were obtained from too "perfect" weapons, not like an ancient log on ropes, swung by a dozen men. There were solid ruins, the newsreel will not let you lie. And what happened to these ruins after 20-30 years? Not a single one remained. Everything was as before, before the war, they even painted it with the

same paint. Is that clear? Do you know why, for example, a village of 20 houses did not form on the site of Warsaw? So don't lie that "Jerusalem was just a pile of ruins" for several thousand years after the "attack" of some Nebuchadnezzars.

So. Let's talk now about the "self-awareness of the Israeli people", which was "suppressed" once and for a thousand years. What example can I give you so that all the nonsense about this "self-awareness" would immediately become clear? Well, let's take, for example, half the population of the European USSR, whose "consciousness" was suppressed for almost four years by the extremely insolent Germans. No "tiglath-pilesers" could have suppressed for so long, firstly, they didn't have much time, since they ate everything, drank everything, put it in their pockets, and they had nothing left to do but go home. Secondly, they had no newspapers, no radio, no cinema to speed up the process of changing "self-awareness". Therefore, it was much more difficult for the "tiglath-pilesers" to change the "self-awareness" of the beaten Jews. But it was a hundred times easier for the Germans in comparison. And what did we see after the lifting of the occupation in the USSR? Yes, the same as before the occupation. On the third day, everyone went to work at the collective farm, received newspapers from Moscow, turned on Moscow radio, and lived as before on a beggarly salary, or without it at all, without any change in "self-awareness". Or were the ancient Jews too tender? It doesn't look like that either.

I'll talk about the "tenfold intensity of self-awareness" when we find ourselves there, in Babylon, together with Renan and the Jews. But for now, I'll offer Renan. Wouldn't it be better to accept my version of Jewish movements on the world stage, which I outlined in the introduction? Less paper will be spent on these idiotic wars, and more will be left over for the development of nations themselves.

"Babylonian Captivity"

It was not for nothing that I put the title in quotation marks. There was no captivity. The Jews simply got to Babylon, pushing their way through the nations, much earlier than some of them ended up in Palestine for the same trade affairs as in Babylonia. And now Renan will try to prove this to me, without suspecting it. Well, for example, like this: "If we exclude the soldiers, most of whom were killed or fled to Egypt, and the people from the lower classes who remained in Judea, then we can say that the entire Jewish nation (we want to say - that which truly constitutes the nation, i.e. its head) was thus resettled around 585 BC to the banks of the Euphrates River".

I will return to the days close to us, when it is especially impossible to lie to historians, since there were still living people left. I mean the last war. Of course, they were taken into German slavery. But this is such a tiny part of the occupied population that talking about it as the "head of the nation" is simply ridiculous. Napoleon did not deport anyone at all. And the Germans would not have deported anyone either, but all their men were taken to the front, and there was simply no one to make tanks, bombs and other military equipment. Why did the Mesopotamians need it? They did not need it. Renan himself writes.

Look: "Babylon, at the moment when the Jews were resettled there, brilliantly emerged, thanks to Nebuchadnezzar, from the decline in which it had been for a long period. The new buildings erected by the king and the old buildings restored by him place him alongside the greatest of the king-builders who ever existed". Therefore, the "captive Jews" would not have had time to do all this, since "that moment" had not yet passed. However, Renan himself adds a little lower: "Nothing proves that the resettled Jews were used for this work. It seems that they were more likely engaged in agriculture. They are found in the villages of

Tell Mellah, Tell Harsha, Kerub Addan, which seem to have been located in the vicinity of Babylon. **The trade** (emphasis is always mine) and industry of Babylon reached enormous proportions".

Before continuing the quotation, I want to say something. Firstly, even in Renan's time, Jews never and nowhere engaged in agriculture, and he knows this very well. Only the Amhaars, the most despised people for the Jews, can engage in agriculture. As for industry, Renan should also know that industry began only in his time, and before that, until the very "bottom of the century", there was nothing but amateurish work. Secondly, the resettled Jews would not have had time to establish trade, which "reached enormous proportions". But no one except the Jews traded on a large scale. This means that the Jews settled there long ago, did all this long ago, and we must "thank" not Nebuchadnezzar, but them. And "on paper" Jewish resettlement is not at all necessary. Regarding Renan's twice-used "as it seems", you can generally perceive it as nonsense. And now I will continue the quotation from the interrupted place.

"They aroused the wrath of the prophets, but it is quite possible that the secular elements of the people were less hostile to them and even took an active part in them. Communication with the lower strata of the population, who spoke Aramaic, forced the **emigrants** (? - my) to speak this language, the area of which then extended over the entire basin of the Tigris and Euphrates. **Everyone learned this language, without losing the use of their national speech** (? - my). "Soferimi" continued to write in the ancient Hebrew dialect. But even those who spoke and wrote in Hebrew began to use many Aramaisms from then on".

So, Renan gets it, in short: they captured the Jews, took them away, and there was extensive trade, high prosperity, only palaces standing. The Jews quickly "took part in the trade", learned to speak in a new way, but precisely because of this they did not forget their old speech. Their prophets, however, did not approve of all this, and were even "angry". What madness. Is it possible to write all this without smirking in your soul? Not to mention that the Jewish captives suddenly turned into emigrants.

Moreover, Renan, having turned the captives into emigrants, continues to raise the status of the Jews practically to the status of the Mesopotamians who "captured" them: "In material terms, the Jews were by no means in the position of slaves; they were in the position of displaced or exiled people, free in everything except the choice of place of residence. <…> A significant number of Jews took up positions that quickly brought them prosperity. Almost all were allocated plots of land that allowed them to build houses and plant gardens. <…> A significant majority felt good under the order of things, which protected them from the calamities of war; only the Pietists remained wholeheartedly faithful to Zion and dreamed only of returning. They remained poor and were dissatisfied with those who acquired wealth almost constantly by serving the vices or luxury of their conquerors. These rich men were in their eyes something like deserters, who would be punished by the perfect David, who would one day reign in the name of Yagweh".

If we discard all the idiocy of conquest and migration, which Renan himself has just shown us in perfect form, then it is impossible to accept anything other than what I wrote in the introduction above and in the "parallel" article "The Judeo-Israeli Cocktail". Jewish traders penetrated Mesopotamia and brought it to a new level of scientific, technical and cultural progress, giving them a written language. That is why Renan got it that the "captives" quickly learned a foreign language without losing their own. In reality, it was a new language based on Hebrew, but with elements of the aboriginal "Aramaic". Some Jews continued to trade and expand beyond Mesopotamia with the true Deuteronomy in their hands. These were the same Renan "dissatisfied pietists dreaming of returning..". The second part of the Jews, more intelligent and literate,

infiltrated the ruling elite of the natives, developed sciences and arts and built palaces for themselves and their already native relatives. The "pietists", of course, were dissatisfied.

Then the phrase of Renan, which I quote, will be more justified: “The main organ of the nation was with them; I mean the ancient writings, which already made up a fairly significant volume. **The exiles** (it should be crossed out, replacing with free traders - mine), undoubtedly had baggage with them, loaded on donkeys or camels”. But it is absolutely impossible to imagine “donkeys and camels with the main organ of the nation in packs” of those Russians who were driven to Germany by the Germans during the war. They, “naked as a falcon”, were loaded into cattle cars and transported, without any “organs of the nation”, they would have only arms and legs. But those Jews who voluntarily left Russia in search of better places, these “packs with organs of the nation” look much better. But this was not connected with the conquest? This was the settlers’ own will, wasn’t it?

Here is a direct confirmation of my version by Renan, if, of course, we remove the idiotic captivity, leaving only what I say: “The Israelite people had almost no relations with the upper classes of Babylonia. Many Jews entered into the service of the Chaldean aristocrats and adopted Chaldean names, not bothering about their pagan meaning. This was not an apostasy from the faith and was no more shocking than the fact that the Jews, under Roman rule, called themselves Apollonius or Hermas. So far as it is permissible to imagine such a distant and as yet poorly explained past, we can distinguish in Babylon two upper classes, both of which are ill-suited by their nature to being able to exercise a lasting influence on a people like Israel: the first class is the warrior class, cruel and ferocious, representing a kind of **evil and arrogant redskins**. The second class was the learned caste, already rationalistic, naturalistic, atheistic, from which Greece would soon ask for lessons in science**. These two aristocracies were a direct denial of the God of Israel**”.

I said that, having infiltrated the local elite, the Jews, accustomed to intensive mental work and the bustle of trade, suddenly freed themselves from the bustle and directed all their efforts to science and the arts. For prisoners, as Renan presents them to us, this is not only difficult, but also impossible. Except, perhaps, for Moses in Egypt. But that is the only case. And here, you see, they made up a whole class. As for the "evil and arrogant redskins”, who are undoubtedly American Indians. I wonder if Renan would have been considered "evil and arrogant" not by the redskins, but by the red tankers, if they had met him somewhere near the Tuileries with a grenade launcher in his hands? Rhetoric. Pure.

It remains to consider the "first class of the aristocracy". Naturally, any elite is divided into brainless warriors and Turgenevs, Tolstoys, Herzens. When many foreigners came to us, most of them gave birth to famous "Russian" researchers, scientists, and even the most famous expert on the Russian language, Vladimir Dahl. And the most famous warriors, for the most part, starting with Sheremetev, remained Russian. There was little desire to learn. Learning to swing a saber is easier. Moreover, at "headquarters", and not on the battlefield. But even in the family there is a black sheep. In a completely different place, Renan writes: "Starting from this moment (which is of no interest to me), Izmail (Jew - my) began to lead the life of a fierce robber. <…> A group of eighty pilgrims who came from Samaria, from Shechem, from Shiloh, in mourning clothes and with wounded figures, to offer sacrifices and incense on the ruins of the temple, were killed by him in the most cruel manner”.

And I also want to draw attention to the words of Renan, with which he paints the picture that "the Israeli people had almost no relations with the upper classes of Babylonia", but "many Jews entered into the

service of the Chaldean aristocrats". Doesn't Renan want all Jews to become aristocrats? This is not the case even in Russia, despite the fact that the Russian elite has long been 70 percent Jewish. And it seems that the Russians did not take them prisoner.

What the hell do Jews need a temple for?

Just look. The Jews are always running around with their ark, a boat with handles, their temple is always "destroyed". Even Napoleon did not find this temple in the village of El-Quds. And only in our days something was built there for tourists. But you can't stop listening to talk about it like a lousy person about a bathhouse. What does this mean? In my opinion, the Jews never needed this temple at all. It's just a hassle. Scattered across the earth by their own will in order to improve their lives, why have this temple? Perhaps for the Hajj, like to Mecca. But the Jews haven't done that for a long time, although it was they who invented the Hajj. Stop. There was a time when they needed a single temple. Then they passed this thing on to Islam as a legacy (see the parallel article mentioned). But that was when the Jews hadn't yet moved beyond the Red Sea. When they hadn't yet reached the Persian Gulf. Therefore, the real Jerusalem should be sought somewhere near Mecca, or in it itself. But the Jews themselves, who assimilated with the natives of Mesopotamia and Persia and created Islam, have long since stopped letting them in. So they invented Jerusalem, which is always “destroyed” or completely absent from the area, remaining only on maps almost to this day.

When did the Jews find it necessary to do without a temple, having it only in their souls? It was when they needed a boat with handles to carry the stone with the Moses` covenant, and, as is known, it appeared in “Egypt”. There they also had Levites in each “family”, that is, paid priests, of whom so many were needed because a hundred times fewer would have been needed for the temple. Much is known about the “Egyptian” Jews, but nothing about the Mesopotamian-Persian ones. And how will they be known if those of them who infiltrated the ruling elite and invented Islam for themselves for their further comfortable existence have long been considered "Arabs", and those who remained under the true Deuteronomy, went on to comb the nations, created the Khazar Khaganate, and then generally spread throughout Eastern Europe, arose as if from nothing? But this was not right, people began to understand that "nothing comes from nothing", so they needed Jerusalem, and in retrospect, otherwise they would not believe. They would have aimed at Mecca, but it was too late to lay claim to it. You see, even in Palestinian Jerusalem, what a mess played out.

History had to be rewritten. Apart from the nomadic Jews-Jews and "sedentary" Islamic Jews from the top of the East, there were no literate people. Therefore, everything turned out very well, there was no printing press. Corrected one book, and here you have a new story. Of course, there was not one book, but several, well, maybe forty. And you can’t correct them all equally. After all, these books were hanging around with numerous “arks”. You don’t think that from Spain to Indochina and from the Khazars to Ethiopia there was a single ark for the Jews, or a wireless telegraph to synchronize the contents of many arks? That’s where the confusion came from. Therefore, all these books must be read skillfully. Having built up a methodology and criteria for evaluation in your head in advance. But first you need an idea to which this methodology must be applied, and to evaluate all the confused information, in accordance with the general trend of development according to the idea. This idea is crude and primitive – the idea of trade, which came to the Jews from hunger in their native desert.

If an idea is fruitful, it gives a lot of food, a lot of food – the desire to multiply, the desire to multiply – it is necessary to expand across the pasture. Until the entire pasture is filled. The pasture will soon be filled, but that is not my concern. Then another idea will be needed. Or it will be necessary to die. Or return to the previous, narrow and hungry existence. That is simple. It is more difficult to wade through lies, which are partly considered “for the good”, as lying historians sometimes think. But not only for this. Generally speaking, it is not advantageous for the Jews to have their history in the public eye. For the history of the world up to the most recent history is in fact the history of the Jews, and was written by the Jews. Sometimes in their own name, sometimes in the name of the Egyptians, sometimes in the name of the Babylonians, sometimes in the name of the Greeks and Romans. But I do not want to say that the Jews have a “Zionist conspiracy” regarding history. Only uneducated people or scribblers who are pre-emptively motivated by money to pursue an “idea” can come up with this anti-Semitic nonsense. To make it clearer, I’ll give you an example. Is there a single person who doesn’t have an action or even a thought about it that he would not only like to hide from others, but is embarrassed to even remember? That’s why a writer who knows that he alone wrote it will pass over in silence or slightly correct something that he is embarrassed to even think about.

You can’t forbid living with your mind, or acquiring your mind either. But your mind gives you power and an easier life among your own kind. And all those millennia in which the Jews prospered, as evidenced by the very fact that they reproduced well, this prosperity could not help but happen at the expense of others, because they don’t live on the moon. Maybe that’s why I’m digging into their history? I don’t want to offend them, but to find out the truth.

Let’s get back to business. So, they don’t need the temple, the Levites who had multiplied are enough for them. Here is what Renan writes: “The Levites, so numerous since the time of Josiah and whose fate constantly occupied the author of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, were in the state of beggars in the ranks of the emigrants”. And in what “state” were they to be if the Jews of the highest rank went to Islam, and the Orthodox Jews went further into the unknown world? Renan continues: “The priests must also have been in a very dire situation: since Josiah’s reform made any cult impossible outside the walls of the Jerusalem temple, no sacrifices could be made. The priests and Levites, who lived from sacrifices, were therefore left without any means of subsistence”.

I interrupt to explain something. Priests and Levites, generally speaking, are one and the same, only the former were at the temple, and the latter – at families, which I understand as clans. But if logically there was no temple and it was not needed by the scattered Jews, then there were no temple priests, but we need to reason further about the Levites. The Levites were needed by those Jews who remained with Judaism and continued to comb the nations, but those Jews left, freed from the extra "burden". And those who remained were left out of work during the formation of Islam. After all, they "kept within themselves" the religion of the new barons assimilating with the natives, which was becoming obsolete before their eyes. And as such, they had to enter into a struggle for their existence, and at the same time for the "obsolete" religion. So they had to find themselves "in a dire situation". And "Josiah's reform" is simply a formula for "distress". Note that, on the whole, the Jews "in Babylonian captivity" lived well.

And what, actually, did Josiah do there? Here is a quote: “Yagweh of the new Torah, compiled under Josiah, like Yagweh in the view of Jeremiah, is simultaneously the God of heaven and earth and the God of Israel. <…> In reward for fidelity, which is also of low quality, for it is not impartial, he promises Israel human

happiness; the latter consists in the possession of large and magnificent cities that Israel did not build, food that it did not collect, wells that it did not dig, vineyards and olive groves that were not planted by it".

So it was Judaism that began to split in two. Into Judaism proper, and into Islam. Do you see how Yagweh splits in two, beginning to serve both "yours" and "ours"? He splits in two in order to elicit obedience from some and justify the claims of others. But let us better listen to Renan further: "To ascribe anything to oneself is the most terrible crime. He who says: by my own power I have brought myself all this, he is as if robbing a part of the glory of Yagweh. " It is precisely this part, just quoted, that is intended for the natives, who must serve already not the pure Jews, but those who have been introduced into the native power. And this is already the purest Islam. Everything is predetermined by Allah, and there is no need to pretend to be smart! Do everything according to the template, and in "that" life everything will be "okay" for you.

But for smart people who do not believe in immortality, it is a completely different matter: "This jealous God grants to all who serve him everything, except for the impossible, i.e. immortality; they are granted life, rapid increase of the nation, perfect happiness, rain on time and all other blessings on earth. The world exists only for them alone: "You will destroy all the nations that Yagweh, your God, will give you; your eyes will have no compassion for them". Note that Islam is a dual religion, for the people and for its elite.

Good gentlemen, find a place for the Levites here. You won't find one. But Renan has another reason: "Here lies the reason for the different fates of the emigrants from Samaria and those from Jerusalem, one hundred and thirty-three years after that. The Yagwehism of the emigrants from Samaria was not yet tied in a knot, it quickly unraveled; the ten tribes disappeared; their names retained only a sacred meaning. Judah, on the contrary, was in exile, like a metal bolt, because during this time (133 years, a historical moment - mine) there were Josiah, Jeremiah, Deuteronomy (as a book that has no relation to the true Deuteronomy - a tablet - mine). There was the Law, it was that great solder that held together the parts of a small world broken by conquest".

I will not criticize this nonsense, it is unworthy of serious criticism. I'd better quote from another book, a modern one: "So what is it – Ermak's secret? The key to it is Russia itself and its **cosmic predetermination**, conditioned by a combination of geophysical and universal factors. Ermak is a typical Russian passionary who draws his strength from mother Earth herself. **What has been said is not a metaphor, but an indisputable fact**, if only we take a cosmist-biospheric position" (p. 340). If that's not enough, here's another: "Where does such determination come from? It all comes from the same place – from the biosphere and noosphere, which – multiplied by the electromagnetic, torsion and **other energy** of the Siberian land – lead to a passionate "outbreak" in the soul of the leader, and he then "infects" his surroundings" (p. 376). I took the quotes from the book by "Doctor of Philosophy" V.N. Demin's "Riddles of the Urals and Siberia", emphasis mine.

Ernest Renan licked his lips in his coffin. And almost jumped out to look at Demin, for whom all this nonsense is "not a metaphor, but an incontrovertible fact". As for the still living Renan, I wanted to take his following words as an epigraph to this article: "Hence the strange fact that the Babylonian captivity changes almost nothing in the history of the Israeli people" (p. 485).

Of Yagweh himself, it is impossible to say better than "an amazing poet who wished to be lost in the rays of Isaiah's glory", into whom "several songs of rare beauty slipped", "the most amazing ... prophetic passage":

"Whoever is caught there will be slaughtered,

Whoever hides there will fall by the sword.

Their children will be crushed before their eyes,

Their houses - plundered, wives - dishonored".

(p. 504).

Any religion is like that! Magic is the religion of everyone who is afraid at all, and everyone is afraid! But magic is an individual religion, done by everyone only for himself. Therefore, all religions hate magic, and fight it more than witches, who are burned at the stake.

Where is the "promised land"?

What do you mean where? In Babylonia, "taken" by the Persians!

True, after Babylon had been "taken" by the Persians. Although, as you have seen above, even under the Babylonians the Jews lived, as the youth say today, not sourly. "Under the rule of the Achaemenid dynasty the Jews, in fact, felt better than under anyone else's rule throughout their long history. They, generally so inclined to complain, never complained about the Persian Empire. Under such a regime everything went as well as possible for the cause of the Jewish pietists. At the price of some forms of external respect, poorly concealing considerable internal contempt, they received protection from their neighbors, who were always unfavorably disposed toward them, and were sheltered from the disasters of the great world revolutions, about which they could, according to their custom, create senseless speculations".

All this is not explained in any way. Renan simply goes on to write that "the corruption of morals came later, when Babylonia defeated its conqueror and imposed on the Achaemenid Empire what it later imposed on the Sassanids and the Caliphs - its civilization, its moral vulgarity, its deep depravity, its effeminacy". As you can see, this is not an explanation of the previous phrase, although it is interesting in itself. Therefore, we must figure out for ourselves why the Jews lived so well under the Persian rule?

Judeo-Israeli cocktail

Introduction

This article is a continuation of my article "Renan confirms my concept of the history of the Jews". Therefore, you should read the introduction to it, so that I do not repeat myself. The introduction outlines the general principle on which, as I believe, one should approach the study of history. It would also be suitable for this article. But the article itself is devoted to purely fragmentary, unrelated information from Jewish history described by Ernest Renan (History of the Israeli People), which, interpreted in a new way, it seems to me, confirm my concept of the development of Jewish history, the general features of which I also outlined there. This history is included in more detail in my book The Mysterious Russian Soul against the Background of World Jewish History and a number of my other smaller works.

Here I would like to raise separately the issue of the "Judeo-Israeli" cocktail or vinaigrette, by which I mean the history of the division of the Jews into Judeans and Israelites, coexistence, "wars" between them, and their subsequent connected-unconnected fate. This is a big question, it requires a lot of paper, and therefore would look like a foreign large insertion in the mentioned article, not connected with the general idea of the mentioned article.

Meanwhile, this "cocktail" is almost the main reason for the development of world history the way it developed. But for this we need to understand the essence of the origin and action of this "cocktail", which, as I think, is not entirely clear to historians. Until now, historians understand this essence purely mechanically, and nothing has changed since the time of Renan. But since it was Renan who described in great detail the connected-unconnected fate of the Israeli and Jewish "kingdoms", it is more convenient for me to argue with him, defending my version.

Roughly speaking, the Jews divided into two "kingdoms" due to minor ideological differences regarding their god Yahweh, transferred all this to the military phase and, using the help or enmity of their neighbors, brought each other to "exile" God knows where. In general, everything resulted in military actions, so dear to historians. Therefore, in this mess, which distinguishes every war, and there are countless of them in this history, nothing became clear. Everything was blurred, mixed up. And especially the ideological principles themselves, some of which, without any basis or sorting, were attributed to one side, then to the other. In the most chaotic order. This happened because there was no watershed, no basis on which these principles should be attributed to one side or another.

I think I have found this basis, or rather two rods on which all the facts of Judean and Israelite history should be strung separately. It is also necessary to take into account that my Judeans are constantly changing into Israelites and back, which, of course, is not the case in written history. In it, they fight until their last breath, like Spartacus in Giovagnoli.

Since I myself am confused in the "rods", then it is necessary to develop terminology. My Judeans will be those Jewish traders who live according to Moses' Deuteronomy, moreover, according to that Deuteronomy, so that you do not get confused, in which there are no moral dogmas, but only religious ones. (See the mentioned article and other works). This Deuteronomy is based on the fact that religion is separate, and jurisprudence, to which morality is subordinated, is separate. This idea helps the Jews to live at someone else's expense, roughly speaking, being among other peoples, but in no way mixing with these peoples.

With the Israelites it is more complicated. These are the Jews who, having half ceased to be pure traders, devoted an increasingly larger part of their lives to their penetration into the ruling elite of the countries into which they had initially penetrated as traders. It was the Israelites (according to my classification, of course) who first created Judeo-Christianity (Orthodox faith, which is not the same as Orthodoxy), which can also be called Nestorianism, and then, in an internal struggle, transformed it into Islam and Catholic Christianity. Which, in turn, in the struggle with Orthodox faith, was transformed into Orthodoxy. (Details in my other works). That is, without departing from Deuteronomy in their souls, the Israelites created a new religion within the countries of their presence in the ruling elite, so to speak, for the people. Only for the people - one side of the religion, and for their rulers - the other side of the same religion.

In order to pull it all off without fail, an ideological leap was needed. Such a leap, at first glance, outwardly very attractive, was a leap back, a leap into the "First Law", which the Jews themselves rejected, seeing its utopianism. "First Law", see at least the aforementioned article, as well as other works, is when soup and flies are in one plate, morality and divine ritual - in one bottle. And when you chase two hares at once, you will catch neither. This is precisely why Christ, a subtle connoisseur of the psychology of the masses, was needed. But when secular authorities, for example, of two countries, in fact - two coalitions of countries, quarreled, then, tell me, how can Muhammad not appear in opposition to Christ?

It is not at all necessary for Christ and Muhammad to appear on Christ's day. They appeared long before that, in the depths of classical Judaism itself. That is why I needed Renan, a great expert of that time, only he mixed all his knowledge into one big heap. But I have already spoken about this. Just note that there were no actual wars on this matter between the Israelites, the Judeans and other peoples who "captured" them every now and then, not counting the religious wars that are happening before our eyes, and a little earlier. And also pay attention to the fact that "Deuteronomy", which became an integral part of Christianity, is not the Deuteronomy of the Jews at all, but precisely the "First Law", in which the Jews had both religious and moral dogmas.

How did Renan's "Israeli" kingdom end?

Samaria in Renan is something like the capital of the Northern Kingdom - Israel, "perished". Although I will immediately say that in Russia alone two rivers of Samara arose, one flows into the Volga, the second - into the Dnieper. Samar in Hebrew means guard, protection, watchman, although it seems to me that the word border guard, simply border or limit, is closer, but we will talk about this later, in the article about the Khazar Khaganate.

Renan writes on this subject: “It can be argued that the disappearance of Samaria from the historical scene was beneficial to that common cause, which, by virtue of some mysterious destiny, fell to the lot of the descendants of ancient Jacob. Just as the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus turned out to be extremely beneficial for the emerging Christianity, the destruction of Samaria was an unheard-of blessing for Judaism. Israel was not destined to become a secular state”.

That is, the first confusion occurred. According to Renan, this kingdom perished purely mechanically, enemies came and destroyed it. And as for the “mysterious destiny” to perish, you can generally spit on it, since it is not decipherable. But all this would be to hell if Renan had not assigned the Kingdom of Judea a purely mechanical life in the form of a "secular" state, which up until 1948 had never existed. Since the Jews left Yemen and up until 1948 (present-day Israel), the Jews had no statehood, they lived like weeds in the wheat fields, conquering, thanks to their indestructibility, more and more new fields.

The second part of this confusion is that the "lost Israel" was not Israel, but was, according to my classification, Judea, that is, an adherent of the true Deuteronomy, that is, "weeds" that do not interfere with the life of the "fields", but only consume nutrients in these fields, and freely spread to new "fields". Therefore, the current state of Israel is not actually Israel, being Judea, which settled down, contrary to logic, on a piece of land where there is no "wheat" to share the earth's nutrients with. This happened, firstly, from fear during the Second World War, and secondly, from ignorance of true history. This state should be called Sedentary Judea, as opposed to Wandering Judea.

And Renan tries to confuse the issue even more: “Samaria could never resurrect itself for political life after the blow dealt to it by Shalmaneser. One of the characteristic features of Assyrian policy was the tendency to change the composition of the population in the various conquered countries. <…> The population of Palestine had already moved in the direction of the vast desert plains of Babylonia. <…> A significant part of the Israelite people was resettled in Assyria and settled in Halaken… The Judaites had a vague idea for a long time of their scattered brothers. When the inhabitants of Judea were brought by exile to the same places, there was no longer any religious affinity between the two parts of Israel”.

You see what nonsense the historian is talking, having no rod in his presentation. He should understand that if he divided the Jews into Judea and Israel, then the use of “both parts of Israel” looks absolutely idiotic. I already said that he had everything dumped into an unimaginable heap. And again these notorious "resettlements". They simply cannot exist, and I have proven this many times in my other works. I repeat every time that I do not mean renegades from peoples who migrate of their own free will, and sometimes, due to the good life in a new place, exceed the number of the mother area. But the mother area always remains, and it is considered a "country, a people", and not renegades who assimilate in new conditions and cease to exist as a people. But as for the fact that "there was no religious closeness", this is precisely what says that the Judeans and Israelites (in my terms) should not have it. After all, some have already created a new religion together with the natives, while others remained with their beloved Yahweh, or rather with Deuteronomy.

The next confusion: "Northern Yagwehism was not strong enough to withstand the test of exile. We will see, on the other hand, that Jerusalem Yagwehism, or, more precisely, Judaism, emerges more powerful from exile and is reborn on the soil from which it was torn away by force, in greater splendor than ever”. That is, Renan concludes that if "Northern Yagwehism" did not withstand, and "Jerusalem Yagwehism" withstood this far-fetched cataclysm, then did the Jewish people also half die out? Or half become Christian? Or Islamic? But he does not say this, but makes us guess. That's the point, that without a boundary that must be clearly kept in mind, it turns out to be nonsense. But he cannot allow himself to admit nonsense, so he follows a completely unimaginable in the right mind, far-fetched concept that half of the people disappeared somewhere due to microscopic disagreements within the faith. But he says it outright: “There is no doubt that such an interpretation of events (the Bible - mine) was formed after the captivity of the Judaites, under the influence of the feud that split Jerusalem and Samaria”. But “it was not the “Judeans” who were captured, but the “Israelites”, because Samaria, according to Renan, is the capital of Israel. That is, Renan seeks answers to questions that make the Bible incomprehensible within the Bible itself. What kind of fool would rewrite and edit the Bible in such a way as to clearly leave traces of alterations? Traces, of course, remain, but you have to dig deep into it to find them. And what lies on the surface, as a rule, is not worth a damn.

"From now on”, Renan writes further (pp. 340-341), "Judas alone will carry out the task entrusted to the entire people of Israel. He will carry out this task with much greater consistency than the northern tribes. Already half a century before the capture of Samaria, almost all the creativity of the Jewish spirit was concentrated in the Kingdom of Judea”.

Again, triple nonsense. Firstly, he did not selectively mow down half the people, which would have been Stalinist, but purely geographically, so that the Jews would build something "correct”. And this is already absurd. Secondly, without having a clear idea of how the Judeans differ from the Israelites, Renan again writes: "the entire people of Israel”, clearly meaning both, but for some reason naming only the latter. It is also stupid to make a mistake, you are not writing a letter to your beloved. But this can only happen if the difference itself, the very line that must always be kept ready in the head, is indifferent. The third thing is that Renan cannot get rid of the historian's inner need: to have a state in order to write history at all. He does not realize that in those days there were no states at all in the current sense, and they did not need a Jewish state at all, since they had always adapted to live happily among other peoples.

The main thing is that in this whole historical heap that Renan shoveled without sorting it out, there really are diamonds. These are vague information, several times corrected out of place, scattered among

the "empty rock", that among the Jews there were Israelites and Judeans. They participated in different ways in the peoples they combed. And here it would be worth thinking carefully about what this means? And not to "organize" states, wars, captivity-migration and other nonsense, which confuses the matter even more.

Where is the "Judean" people going?

The title of the part of the book that I am now examining is "The Kingdom of Judea", and on 50 pages it is all about kings, wars, captivity-migration and a huge chunk of poetry. It is impossible to understand all this, as if you were reading all the gossip and anecdotes of some city for three hundred years, collected without dates or any other system in one book, moreover, without a beginning or an end, consumed on hand-rolled cigarettes or gun wadding. Each anecdote and gossip are interesting in themselves, but in a heap it is sheer fatigue. Therefore, I will pay attention only to the conclusions that Renan makes from time to time.

Israel, as I have just described through Renan, no longer exists, but the author writes as if nothing had happened: “From that time on, **Israel** (all emphasis is mine) assumed the position it retained for centuries, namely, that of a tiny, malicious people among other peoples, able with astonishing insight to foretell their destruction, which it met with a feeling of joy. A certain Nahum, probably a **Judean**, ... showed extraordinary foresight, ... which led him to think of the coming fall of Assyria, which actually happened ..”. (p. 399). Who else can I complain to if not to you, since Renan has long been dead, that you can't do that. Judean and Israel are root terms and to change their places, whichever comes to mind first, considering them synonyms, is disgusting.

But all this in Renan is like a preface, or rather, like the conversations in the smoking room at a Soviet institute, which take up 70 percent of the total work day of Soviet scientists, before sitting down at a drawing board and drawing a certain number of lines in pencil, so as not to make one more. Renan is simply waiting for the Jewish king Josiah to appear on the historical stage in order to begin the “reforms”. But if I simply rewrite this fundamental part of his work, you still won’t understand anything. Everything is said so carefully, with omissions, silences, dark hints and other writer’s tricks, which the Russian people call “to darken”. I have read all this six times, if not more, and I can firmly say that I still would not have understood anything if I had not already had my own concept in my head, the foundations of which I learned long before reading Renan from James Frazer.

The essence of it is that in the "First Law" the Jews had liturgical and moral commandments in one heap, which confused the Jews. They could not identify themselves in a disunited state among other nations, devoting too much effort not to steal, not to kill, not to have a neighbor's wife, and so on. Then Moses introduced Deuteronomy, in which he left only the liturgy, the service of the god Yahweh, and nothing more. And sent everything else to the judges, not for nothing such an era even blossomed. And the people immediately saw in their religion the will of Yahweh that united them, unclouded by anything else, like "Glory to the CPSU!" approximately. As a result, the Jews, armed on the one hand with a strong and unambiguous ideology of unification among themselves, distant from each other, due to the impossibility of feeding themselves together at the expense of others, on the other hand had their own judicial system, which very strictly regulated "do not steal" and so on. This wonderful system, which I call differently, and here: don't put your eggs in one basket, I never tire of praising in all my works, and with the utmost sincerity. And it allowed them to reach such heights, which they did not even suspect at first. But unclouded

faith in their god allowed them to reach the highest bliss, or rather the "promised land", as they call it among themselves, without anything secondary.

But what I have just said is incomprehensible to narrow-minded people. Short-sighted people do not look at the essence, not at the root of the problem, but at the external "beauty", which I have put in quotation marks for a reason. Therefore, replacing the First Law with Deuteronomy made complete idiots out of them. They could not understand the exclusion from the First Law of "moral" commandments, which are not in Deuteronomy, with their completely blinkered eyes not seeing the "era of judges", the height of perfection, next to Deuteronomy. "Well, what can you expect from crazy people?" Vysotsky said. Now it will become clearer to you when I quote Renan. It will become clearer to you why he exterminated the "Israeli" part of the Jews? Even without actually finding the difference between the Judeans and the Israelites, which I spoke about above, in the introduction.

So, "All of Josiah's reforms were made in fulfillment of the law of Yagweh (I usually write Yahweh), considered to be proclaimed by divine revelation to Moses. Until that time, they often spoke of the Law or Torah of Yagweh, which contains a collection of his plans and is, in a certain sense, his treaty with Israel".

Here I will stop and comment. Renan killed Israel for this. Meanwhile, when he wrote about the "Exodus from Egypt" he mainly used the word "Semites", who are the future Judeans and Israelites in a mixture of fraternal blood, but not ideological. Therefore, Yahweh made all future revelations to Moses without distinguishing which of them would later become Judeans and which Israelites, and purely in the geographical sense. After all, the north and south of Palestine are not an ideological concept. That is, Renan's entire construction collapses on the very first lines. However, I will continue quoting.

"The so-called **Jehovist** version of sacred history contained a small **code of this kind**, called the Book of the Covenant, compiled mainly from the **official point of view of the Kingdom of Israel and considered the Sinai revelation**. **The Elogist** redaction contained similar **moral commandments** (what is known as the Decalogue), which were of a **more general nature** and were **equally accepted as the Sinai revelation**. Both of these small religious codes were explained and complemented each other in the text of the summary version, the **compilation of which we attribute** to the reign of Hezekiah" (the Jewish king - mine).

I will comment. This mysterious phrase is a complete windfall, but why did Renan need it? Could he really, having written 800 pages filled with all sorts of nonsense, not find a place to make this phrase more understandable? What is this mysterious "small code of this kind" that "the Jehovist version contained"? I didn't miss a single letter from the previous quote. And there it is written impersonally that "before that time they often spoke", as if in a market, "of the Law or Torah". Which "in a certain sense" is the treaty of Yahweh precisely "with Israel". That is, from this rebus I should understand that the treaty was made by the Israelites, who did not yet exist then, and are now extinct. But Renan continues to insist that this is "the official point of Israel". "A code of this kind" contains a little bit of something like that, some "Elogist edition" "contains" "moral commandments", "similar" to something. But these moral commandments "are of a more general nature". These two versions are "explained" by the Jew Hezekiah, and then dumped into a heap by him, or rather into a "combined version". Got it? I suspect not, so I will say briefly: the famous commandments of Moses consisted of two versions, one with a moral, and the second in a "more general form", that is, probably, without a moral. And the Israelites are to blame for this. But what I said was suggested to you as if in a dream, almost under hypnosis.

Here you can skip a bit of Renan's text, since it is distracting, pulling your attention to the sides, to the "unclean animals" that cannot be eaten. And then I continue quoting: "All this (including the unclean animals - mine) made up a significant collection of literary works, sufficient to justify commonly used phrases, such as the following: "to keep the law of Yagweh ... in accordance with the law, that is, the commands of Yagweh". However, there was no book that could be called the Torah. Moreover, it must be taken into account that the ancient sacred history was known only to a very limited circle, since it was perhaps only in one copy. Books at that time, like inscriptions made on stone, were something unique of their kind. We have already had occasion to say that at that time books in the real sense were unknown. When a book was copied, then by means of insertions, abbreviations and possible combinations, an entirely different book was obtained. Among the Indian inscriptions of King Asoka, which can be called announcements and which are supposed to be completely identical, there are, however, not two that are completely identical. Thus, the ancient sacred history was almost unknown. In the minds of the Pietists a brilliant idea was born to make a great revolution: their plan consisted not so much in the actual recovery from oblivion of the legislative parts of the ancient text, as in the composition of a new text, in which the **ancient commandments** would be composed in a new form, more adapted to the ideas of their time".

Why so much verbosity? Couldn't this space have been used to make the previous quote clearer? Does Renan need a "significant collection of literary works" only for the formula "to observe the laws of Yagweh"? Or to state that there is no Torah among them? And what does he accuse "King Asoka" of? Then we should blame all people in general for writing greeting cards in different words, for not having "identical" ones. Finally, I get it. Renan needs all this nonsense to tell us, as if between the lines, that the "ancient commandments" need to be corrected somehow. Renan doesn't like them very much. Why is that?

"The need **for such a book** made itself felt especially from the time when the religious activity of the environment surrounding Josiah began to be expressed in the amazing improvement and completion of religion. They felt the need for **such a book**, which would set out and explain the legislative ideals of the theocratic school and the **rules for governing a perfect state according to the plans of Yagweh**. Naturally, the revelation of this code **was attributed to Moses**, according to an idea that goes back to the most ancient era of the Israeli tradition".

I will interrupt "chernomyrdin". Is Moses famous for writing the Torah, this "such a book"? Moses did not write anything at all, if you believe the Bible. He simply went to Yahweh twice and brought "stone tablets" with the ten commandments **for people** carved on them: "First Law" and Deuteronomy. These stones have nothing to do with "state governance", and especially with "rules for governing a perfect state". Besides, Renan needs "such a book", that is, the Torah, in which "this code", that is, the Decalogue, occupies a microscopic part. And this microscopic part was brought from Yahweh by Moses. These are completely different things. Why is something impersonal in the form of "this code" "attributed to Moses"? After all, it is clear to a fool that "this code" is the Decalogue, the Decalogue was brought by Moses from Yahweh. Ah, I guessed: it is the Israelites who are to blame again. It turns out that the idea "goes back" to them. Why obscure it? It would be better to say that Moses himself was an Israelite, although there were no Israelites then, but there were no Judeans either. So, Moses was an Egyptian. But Renan often lets this thought slip out. But then, how and who "attributed" the "Israeli" ideology to Moses? Again a dead end!

Is it possible to write so "mysteriously" if not to use offensive words towards the deceased? Let us go further. "But the Sinai revelation (or, as it was then called, the revelation on Mount Horeb) was already considered then as something finished, as an accomplished fact. In addition to this revelation, they also

**admitted a secondary, more perfect revelation**, announced to Moses on the other side of the Jordan, in the plain of Arboth-Moab, before the highly solemn moment of **Israel's** entry into the promised land. Few people were able to raise the **fundamental objection** arising from the comparison of **both texts**. On the other hand, the **new revelation did not exclude the ancient one**; it was considered only its **further development and completion**. Finally, the **pietistic dexterity** of those circles from which the new version emerged **probably** involved as accomplices in this work those people who were more or less familiar with the ancient texts and could subject the new version to a comparison with the ancient version. Not to mention Jeremiah, who was **apparently** the soul of this deception, we see here in the foreground the chief priest Hilkiah, the sopher Shaphan, son of Azaliah, son of Meshullam, both prominent figures, Ahikam, son of another Shaphan, and Achbor, son of Michaiah, and finally the prophetess Huldah, wife of the keeper of the king's wardrobe, Shalum, son of Tikvah, son of Harhas".

So what can we see in this solid London fog on the banks of the Seine? So, the First Law is a finished "something", an "accomplished fact", and Deuteronomy is like an illegitimate child, which some still "allowed", although it is "more perfect". But what is inside these two "revelations" is still unknown to Renan, and with him to us. Although, a little is known: two or three people were "able to raise the main objection" by comparing these two "texts", but whether they actually did it, Renan does not know. Although, why compare these two texts with the purpose of "raising an objection"? After all, the first "revelation" is "something complete". And the second revelation - "does not exclude" the first "revelation", but "develops" and "completes" it? That is, it turns out that the second revelation is a masterpiece. This is one side of the "coin". Its other side: Why then did Renan need "the pietistic dexterity of those circles from which the new version came"? Is it a masterpiece? Or not a masterpiece? Then why? Without answering this question, Renan got angry and called Jeremiah "the soul of this deception", to which he "apparently" added "accomplices". And even if Renan gave a complete list of all the Jews of that time, it would still be impossible to understand: why was a masterpiece created by deception? And what exactly is this deception? I am already tired of talking about Israel, which did not exist at that time.

Renan further develops the events as follows. "One day, in the eighteenth year of the reign of Josiah, who had already reached the age of twenty-five, the sopher Shaphan, son of Atzaliah (see how he "drags out", repeating the same thing and wedging in unnecessary information, such as "twenty-five years"), came to the temple to supervise the accounting of the work carried out there and to discuss this matter with the high priest Hilkiah. When business matters were settled, the priest told him an extremely terrible secret: "I have found the book of the Law in the temple". Hilkiah handed the new book to Shaphan, who read it. The latter, after reporting to the king about this strange find, added: "I have here the book that the priest Hilkiah gave me", and read it before the king. When the king heard the words of the book of the Law and the threats that accompanied them, he tore his garments and commanded the priest Hilkiah, and Ahikam, and Achbor, and the sopher Shaphan, and Ansaiah: "Go and ask Yagweh about me and about all of Judah concerning the threatening predictions that were found in the book, for terrible is the anger of Yagweh that has burned against us, since our fathers did not listen to the preaching of this book". The king did not doubt the authenticity of this book, but since it was clear that at least since the time of Manasseh (reigned before his predecessor Amon - mine) such threats had not yet been carried out, he asked: would Yagweh agree to take back his threats and whether it was worthwhile to take measures to avert these threats, since the disaster was soon to come? The king's messengers went to the prophetess Huldah, who lived in Jerusalem, in the quarter formerly known as the "Mishneh", and proposed the matter to her. The prophetess, in

agreement with Jeremiah, replied that Yagweh was rightly indignant, but that his anger could be tamed by strict observance of the law".

I interrupt this sweet, but at least coherent, tale to ask: 622 years remain until the birth of Christ, and there is still no monotheism? And if there is, then why the hell does the Judean king send the priests of his "one god Yahweh" to a fortune teller, or rather, to a "prophetess", which is the same thing? Even under Cosimo Medici, such a king would have been sent to the stake along with the fortune teller. And couldn't this whole pack of priests "get in touch" with Yahweh himself? After all, even Moses did it so cleverly!

But let's listen to Renan further. "The new code was adopted as a program of renewed Yagwehism, which the pietists of the new school wished to implement. According to the story of the Book of Kings, Josiah ordered all the inhabitants of Jerusalem to be assembled. The words of the Book of the Covenant, found in the Temple, were read before them. The king, standing on the platform, proclaimed the covenant with Yagweh, which consisted of the following: "To follow the commands of Yagweh with all your heart and with all your soul, to keep his commandments, regulations, and commands, according to what is written in this book". The entire people made a covenant with Yagweh, and **Israel** was restored to Yagweh again, as it was believed to have happened twice before, under Moses and Joshua".

Joshua is the Hebrew for Jesus, wasn't he born then? I mean the martyr and founder of a new religion. And isn't this fact "reinterpreted" awkwardly? This whole thing that Renan describes strongly reminds us of the "Pietists of the new school" under the leadership of Christ. Or are they deliberately fooling us so that we never ask, quite sternly: what are the differences between the First and Second Laws? And will there ever be an end to "Israel"? After all, I hope you haven't forgotten, we are in the Kingdom of Judea, and there is very little time left before the birth of Christ. However, Renan seems to want to take back all his words, which I quoted with such malice. Here is how it happened.

"The circumstances that accompanied this extraordinary event will never become known to us so much that our strict historical tastes could be satisfied. It is only known for certain that this book, so opportunely discovered by Hilkiah, is in our possession. This masterfully composed book, which extends from verse 45 of the IVth chapter of the section of sacred history, called Deuteronomy in the Greek version, to the end of chapter XXVIII of the same section of sacred history".

Firstly, although the "ancient Greeks", especially in Byzantium, are undoubtedly Jews, which I have proven many times in my other works, but still they should not be taken as "witnesses". Because I have and secondly. Deuteronomy is only 10 lines, or points, which easily fit on a third of a page. Therefore, a veal chop cannot be called a whole calf. Even if this chop "extends" from chapters 4 to 28. Secondly, I also include such a crazy number of forgeries, absolutely unambiguously proven, that it is simply horrifying. It is not for nothing that some ancient historian put it something like this: there is nothing written that can be believed unconditionally. That is why I apply simple common sense when reading "historical" books.

Since I have not yet reached the difference between First and Deuteronomy, I will have to quote Renan further. And note that I do not make omissions. I rewrite everything in a row.

"The code actually claims only to be the highest code, but it does not claim any monopoly. The Sinai treaty or the treaty of Horeb did not lose its significance with the establishment of the new treaty. The law proclaimed by divine revelation in **Arboth-Moab** is only a **new proclamation** of it; the **new version** actually makes the **first** useless. The basis of the treaty of Yagweh with his people, **Israel**, is the Decalogue, as it is in

the ancient text. This basic document is reproduced only with minor variations. This new document introduces very few innovations into the legislation. In almost all matters it repeats the prescriptions of the Book of the Union. It has undoubtedly copied the list of clean and unclean animals from an older text, which has only been corrected and abridged. In the mass of casuistic questions it gives only an abridged summary of the previous laws. Concerning lepers it refers to a code which in fact is elsewhere".

I will interrupt again, so that you can follow more easily. First, do not pay attention to Arbot-Moab, since every fool knows that Moses went to Yahweh twice, and twice brought from him tablets with the Decalogue, and the texts on the tablets are different. Secondly, note that Renan says directly, but in confusing words, that the old Decalogue has not lost its meaning with the new Decalogue, since the new Decalogue is only a new **proclamation** of the old Decalogue. But! For some reason the New Decalogue "makes useless" the old Decalogue, I omit the word "properly". So that you understand this nonsense once and for all, I will give you an example that exactly corresponds to the situation under consideration. Let's say you are running to the attack, and shout "Hurray!", run three meters and again: "Hurray!" As you have noticed, the new "Hurray" is a "new proclamation" of the old "Hurray". And this new "Hurray" does not make the old "Hurray" useless. Unless, of course, you swear instead of the new "Hurray". Maybe Renan considers swearing instead of the second "Hurray" to be "a reproduction with minor variations of the main document"?

I am not going to discuss the "list of clean and unclean animals" in the new and old Decalogues. We are discussing, if you have not forgotten yet, which Decalogue contains moral commandments and which does not? This is more important than clean and unclean animals. It is also important that Renan cannot remember that he is describing Judea, always talking about Israel. But I cannot miss a single word of Renan, lest I be accused of "pulling fragmentary thoughts" from a Russian academician of French blood.

"What certainly belongs to our author is the Shema, the cornerstone of Judaism, the short formula of its symbol of faith for centuries:

Hear Israel: Yagweh our God is a very short Yagweh. You will love your God with all your heart, with all your soul and with all your strength. Let everything that I now ascribe to you be constantly in your thoughts. You shall teach them to your sons, and you shall talk of them continually, sitting at home, walking on the road, lying down, and rising up. You shall bind them as signs upon your hands, as bandages upon your forehead; you shall write them upon the doorpost of your house and upon your doors.

In taking this commandment literally and carrying it out in a very crude manner, Judaism has shown a kind of historical insight. The Torah revealed (or rather composed) under Josiah had its foundation in the local religion that had arisen in Palestine in the seventh and eighth centuries B.C. This Torah was the sworn enemy of the universal religion dreamed of by the prophets of the eighth century. Jesus was able to give victory to the spirit of these great prophets only by crushing this Torah and boldly rejecting it. But human affairs are woven of matter and spirit. Freedom and bondage, progress and reaction, the sublime and the base are equally necessary for the construction of the great whole of the living cosmos. Without this timid Torah, the fiery prophecies of the prophets would have remained fruitless; they would have found themselves in the same state as so many other noble manifestations of the human spirit, so exalted in their time, and of which not a trace remains in our time".

All this reminds me of both "Glory to the CPSU" and "Heil Hitler", as well as "Rule, Britannia, the seas" or "South America for the Spaniards". I do not put exclamation marks. But, thank God, at least the tongue-

tiedness has ceased. To comment on the slogans just cited is useless. I will only note that Renan has not yet begun to compare the Decalogues. This is precisely what I expect from him, and this is really important. And one more thing. Renan is an equilibrist, but I am also persistent. However, who needs my persistence? Wouldn't it be better to look at the end of the chapter and see if there is any mention of the differences in the Decalogues? Not only in this chapter, which is dedicated to them, but also in the remaining 700 pages, they are not mentioned anywhere else.

Now I finally understood that all the tongue-tiedness, to which I devoted no less than 5 pages, is the result of the fact that:

Renan knows that the First Law really combines both liturgical and moral commandments, but this stunned him so much that he decided to lie shamelessly, just to somehow gloss over it all;

Renan knows that the moral commandments were thrown out of Deuteronomy, and only the liturgical (service to Yahweh, liturgical) commandments were left, and this stunned him even more, with the same consequences;

Renan did not know and did not even guess that the moral commandments thrown out of Deuteronomy were concentrated in jurisprudence, which, however, was not called that then. It was simply called the Age of Judges. Then the same smart guys like Renan, without realizing that the Era of Judges is parallel to the Era of Deuteronomy, built it like in an army, by rank, that is, by years. And they shoved it into that place on the chronological scale where they had an empty space, without events. So that you believe me, I will give both texts from the stone tablets:

| First Law | Deuteronomy |
|---|---|
| (Given from the Bible as "Deuteronomy") | (Given from K. Buddha) |
| 1. Do not worship another god | 1. Do not worship another god |
| 2. Do not make yourself molten gods | 2. Do not make yourself molten gods |
| 3. All the firstborn belong to me | 3. All the firstborn belong to me |
| 4. Six days you shall work, and on the seventh day you shall rest | 4. Six days you shall work, and on the seventh day you shall rest |
| 5. Honor your father and your mother… | 5. Observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread in the month when the grain ripens |
| 6. Do not murder | 6. Observe the Feast of Weeks, the Feast of the First Fruits of the Wheat Harvest, and the Feast of Ingathering at the end of the year |
| 7. Do not commit adultery | 7. Do not pour out the blood of my sacrifice on leavened bread |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8. Do not steal | 8. Do not let the fat of my feast be kept all night till the morning |
| 9. Do not bear false witness against your neighbour | 9. Bring the first fruits of your land to the house of the Lord your God |
| 10. You shall not covet your neighbor's house; you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his donkey, nor anything that is your neighbor's | 10. The young goat is not to be cooked in its mother's milk |

Here is how D. Frazer comments on this in his book "Folklore in the Old Testament": "If we ask ourselves which of these two divergent versions is the older, there can be only one answer. **It would be strange to suppose, contrary to all historical analogies, that the moral rules which originally formed an integral part of the ancient code were subsequently thrown out and replaced by the rules of religious ritual**. Does it seem probable, for example, that the commandment "do not steal" was later removed from the code and in its place was included the prescription: "The Passover sacrifice must not remain overnight until morning"? Is it possible to imagine that the commandment "do not kill" was supplanted by another - "The young goat is not to be cooked in its mother's milk"? **Such an assumption does not fit in with the whole meaning of human history. It is natural to think that the moral version of the Decalogue, as it can be called from its predominant element, belongs to a later time than the ritual version. After all, it was precisely the moral tendency that gave strength to the teaching first of the Jewish prophets, and then of Christ himself. <…> But if, therefore, of the two versions of the Decalogue the ritual version must, as I think, be recognized as the more ancient**…" I am not interested in the rest.

Only fools who cannot see beyond their noses and do not take the trouble to find out why the Jews conquered the whole world without ever waving a sabre can “think so naturally”. As you can see, Renan is not alone. But Frazer differs from Renan for the better in that he says what he thinks directly, openly, and honestly. And Renan, knowing full well that the “moral” Decalogue is primary, cast such a fog over this simple truth that he made me suffer so much.

As for Christ, I have other works that continue this theme. For example, “The Lost Link of History”

The germination of Judaism by Islam

It is believed that Islam is the youngest branch of Judaism, Christianity is supposedly 600 years older. I believe that Islam is older than Christianity, although it is based on the ideology of Christ, or rather, on the return from the Jewish true Deuteronomy to the "First Law", to the one in which moral and liturgical norms are mixed like flour with bran.

Islam arose in the depths of Judaism in the eastern tribe of Jewish traders, when they massively penetrated the Persian Gulf and the surrounding peoples. The western tribe gave us the "ancient Greeks", the Byzantines, who then, having spread to the Balkans and the Apennines, adopted, changing to their taste, the so-called Judeo-Christianity. But here I will talk about the eastern tribe.

The Jews, penetrating into the semi-wild tribes headed by the ruling elite, quickly noticed that they aroused great interest and respect with their extensive knowledge and trading dexterity on the part of the

aforementioned local elite. And they were quick to take advantage of this, becoming advisers and managers of the illiterate kings. Then came matrimonial aspirations, and before the natives had time to look back, they became closely related to the powerful and moneyed elite of the Jews. The middle and lower classes of Jews remained in their traditional business and continued to expand, combing the peoples that had not yet been combed. And soon they founded the Khazar Khaganate at the intersection of all the transit routes for table salt from the lakes of Alton and Baskunchak in the lower reaches of the Volga. These were the true Judeans, whom Renan calls the Israelites who perished God knows where. They had no reason to change their religion, since it was the true Deuteronomy that allowed them to live well at someone else's expense. But I am not talking about them.

Service and matrimonial penetration into the local elite made the life of the Jews much easier, the constant bustle of trade went away, there was a lot of free time left, which they, genetically accustomed to thinking a lot with their heads, at first did not know what to do with. But this did not last long. The sciences and arts flourished, it is not for nothing that algebra is translated as the science of settlers. This part of the Jews, who suddenly became sedentary, had the opportunity to improve the aboriginal language, since it was becoming their native language. The word sedentarism should not be understood as primitively as historians understand it. Remember how I criticized Renan, who described in colors how the Jews "moved" with their flocks to Mesopotamia, began to graze them in the wheat fields. The Jews have always been sedentary as soon as they descended from their lifeless plateau to the coast of Yemen. But this sedentarism was, so to speak, connected with constant "business trips" of the head of the family and sons on trade matters. In addition, as soon as there were too many Jews, and Jewish women gave birth from a good life God bless everyone, some of them no longer found a place for professional activity in their area. As a result, they had to penetrate further and further into new tribes. This is the complex that historians take for a nomadic way of life, and in vain. It is rather a mobile crystalline lattice of their crystal, still molten, compared to a cooled and hardened crystal. But I started about the language.

Russian writers like to boast of their "great and mighty" language, the English, French and others - too. Meanwhile, more than 70 percent of their words, if you look into it properly, are essentially Jewish. I have repeatedly proven this in my works. Even the criminal "loh" comes from the Jewish "yeloh" - god, not to mention the criminal "feni" which came from ofeni - a Jewish petty trader. Details in other works. Here I only want to say that, enriching themselves with elements of other languages, the Jews introduced these already "their" words into the wide use of the peoples. Without a language developed to the point of hypertrophy, it was impossible for them to engage in their production activities. But, having penetrated and consolidated themselves in the ruling aboriginal environment, the Jews seemed to switch to the local language, in fact creating it almost anew. General education and the "local" language, which the Jews always spoke in the country of residence, further brought them to the forefront in this community. Science, language and culture were concentrated in their clever heads. It was time to think about the ideology of their comfortable existence.

Traditional Deuteronomy was not suitable for this. I had already forgotten for a while about the Jews who continued to penetrate deep into the nations. It was here that Judaism began to adapt to local conditions. Let me begin to quote Renan again.

“The Yagweh of the new Torah, compiled under Josiah, like the Yagweh of Jeremiah, is at once the God of heaven and earth and the God of Israel. He is at once the universal God of the universe and, as such, absolutely just, and the national God – and, as such, unjust. When it comes to his people, he is a selfish and

unjust autocrat. In reward for their loyalty, which is also of low quality because it is not impartial, he promises Israel human happiness; the latter consists in the possession of large and magnificent cities which Israel did not build, food which they did not gather, wells which they did not dig, vineyards and olive groves which they did not plant. These rewards, which are understandable when they come for courage and industry, are here rewards for theological virtue, for faith in one God, one in his own name. Yagweh is truthful; he keeps his covenant. He loves Israel; he has sworn to him; that is enough. It is not the merit of any Israel that is worthy of these favors; it is the free choice of Yagweh himself".

Do you see how Yagweh splits into two, beginning to serve both "yours" and "ours"? He splits into two in order to elicit the obedience of some and justify the claims of others. But let us listen to Renan further: "To attribute anything to oneself is the most terrible crime. He who says: through my own power I have brought myself all this, he, as it were, robs a part of Yagweh's glory". It is precisely this part, just quoted, that is intended for the natives, who must no longer serve pure Jews, but those who have been introduced into the native power. And this is already the purest Islam. Everything is predetermined by Allah, and there is no need to pretend to be smart! Do everything according to the template, and in "that" life everything will be "okay" for you.

But for smart people who do not believe in immortality, it is a completely different matter: "This jealous God grants to all who serve him everything, except for the impossible, i.e. immortality; they are granted life, rapid growth of the nation, perfect happiness, rain on time and all other blessings on earth. The world exists only for them alone: "You will destroy all the nations that Yagweh, your God, will give you; your eyes will have no compassion for them". About destruction and other passions, this is, of course, the cost of a writer's enthusiasm. But compassion or the lack of it is an important matter, for which you must prepare yourself, forcing your innate compassion. Here is an example. In the poorest country in the world in terms of the standard of living of the people, which is Russia, the president has more than a dozen dachas like the fairy tale of Scheherazade each. And the president of the people who live better than anyone in the world is content with one modest dacha. This is what compassion and the lack of it are. If you pity the people, you will never live in "this" life like a pig with oranges.

Note that Islam is a dual religion, for the people and for its elite. This is even more pronounced than in Christianity. In Christianity, the hierarchs eat halva on the sly. Note that Renan is talking about not only pre-Hometite times, but also pre-Christian times. And only narrow-minded people or cunning people do not see, when describing history, what they, in their position as historians, should see.

Remembering where we are on the historical scale, I quote Renan further "about the Judeans": "The legislation that follows from such premises is naturally not imbued with tolerance. The measures taken to establish Yagwehistic monotheism bear the imprint of extreme severity. In this regard, Deuteronomy differs little from the code of the Dominican Inquisition of the 12th and 14th centuries. The extermination of infidels, the prohibition of all relations with them, especially mixed marriages, based on the view that religious heresies arise as a result of female temptations, the merciless destruction of all objects of idolatry and absolute iconoclasm. "You must exterminate evil from among you" - such is the bloody formula that motivates these behaviors.

But this is direct Islam, and not Judaism at all, although it is written, as it were, in Judean books. The books themselves are all from the East. In which Islam supposedly has not yet arisen. As for "Deuteronomy", which Renan now uses, I will say that it is simply a fake. Deuteronomy is simply a decalogue, a formula

obtained after long life calculations. And if someone wants to use a word they like to denote a completely different concept, then this is like an additional trump ace hidden up their sleeve, for which they can get hit on the head with a candelabra.

Needless to say, Renan's example of the "Dominican Inquisition" is not even close. I have another irrefutable proof that the formula "You must exterminate evil among you" is not intended for the elite, but for the stupefied people. Moreover, it is of purely Eastern origin, and not "inquisitorial", preferring the fire. For a long time I could not understand the true essence of the method of execution "stoning". The literature on this subject that I came across is full of nonsense. Meanwhile, this is a very inconvenient and ineffective type of execution, which - they spend too much effort, the efficiency of which is close to zero. The phrase just mentioned opens our eyes to the solidarity of murder, which is ineffective in execution, but super effective in uniting the people "in anger", in anger directed by a deft hand.

But this is also pure Islam. Just like the very meaningful words: he will not throw a stone in my direction. Or let him try to throw. That is, go against everyone. Stones should also be thrown wholesale at such “as one, we will die”. But that’s not all. Renan writes: “One can shudder at the thought that in these investigations of sorts, only the slander of two or three witnesses is enough, with such an illusory guarantee of the correctness of their accusation as the obligation that the witnesses must throw the **first stone** (emphasized by me). Two people, having agreed among themselves, can ruin a man irrevocably”. The rule of the “first stone”, like all the other stones, was used not only in the East, but also by Stalinism, fascism, and Nazism. That is, **compulsory religions, religions of fear**. And does Renan really lack the intelligence to understand this? Rather, his conscience. After all, he has such a high opinion of the Jews, who “gave the world Christ”. This, of course, is much lower than I think of them. But still, it would be too stupid for the Jews, highly developed in trade and communication, to attribute the invention of a violent religion **to themselves**. For the Judaism of true Deuteronomy. Judaism is highly voluntary, that is its beauty and longevity. And for Islam and Christianity, the religions of illiterate fools, this is just right. So, without knowing it, Renan writes not about Judaism, but about Islam, which is emerging in its depths.

Here I must make a digression. I shout everywhere that I hate chronology. It is so confused that not a single date can be believed absolutely and unconditionally. One can only say that a given event happened earlier, and another - later. Moreover, in no case can this opinion be substantiated by dates, but only by analysis, that another event could not have happened without the first. In this regard, I want to slightly relax those people who believe that all these wisdoms, for example, were given by Solomon or Moses. Of course, both the First Law and Deuteronomy were created by touch, by many people and gradually, testing them and correcting them. Therefore, the fact that the Jews ascribed to themselves in advance the primacy in the world, which has really existed for a long time, is a deception. They did it gradually, but writing these thoughts retroactively into the "old" books when these thoughts had already been confirmed by practice. So it turned out that they knew everything in advance, especially with regard to all sorts of prophets. And this is simply a **method of convincing young people**, who, using this method as an example, see that the prophets do not lie. And, therefore, we must do as the rabbi or rebbe says, I have already forgotten what it is called correctly. Therefore, such a convincing religion does not need violence when introducing people into their heads. All other religions, including Islam, are religions for slaves, day laborers and servants. And they demand coercion, “security”, “purity”, and all sorts of additional things in the form of SS men, KGB men, and “guardians of Islam”.

Islam in the Heart of Israel

Solomon died, other kings reigned for a short time. And here it is: "... despite the fact that the north (Israel - mine) did not have a temple (it remained in the south, in Judea - mine), similar to Jerusalem, often, when talking about religious affairs of this area, they talk about the "house of Yahweh", located in Bethel or Shiloh. The custom of bringing there the first fruits, paying tithes there and coming three times a year to celebrate hag - little by little becomes regular".

I wrote this out only for the sake of the word hag, which can be read other than "hajj". And which "was celebrated very solemnly", "pilgrimage was generally to the taste of the tribes of Israel". There is nothing more to add here.

What has just been introduced is attributed to eternity

Having divided the original Judaism into a religion for slaves and a religion for their masters, Renan pretends that this state of affairs has been eternal. Of course, it happens that some nations have one tendency, while other nations have another tendency. But not to such an extent that half of the nations look at life as early childhood, and death for the glory of Allah as eternal bliss "later", while the other half look at death as the final reckoning, after which "there is nothing". And everything that is due must be received in "this" life. And if Islam had created itself, as they say, out of nothing, then this would be understandable. But the point is that I am quoting Renan not about Islam, about which he does not say a word in this book, but about Judaism, namely about its development on a chronological scale. And the closer to our days, the more Judaism in that part which is not intended for the chosen ones of Yahweh becomes more and more similar to Islam. But I have already written enough about this.

And suddenly, at the end of the "Babylonian" captivity, intercepted by the "Persian" captivity, in the chapter "The Future Jerusalem" Renan preaches in the words of the Jewish "Great Anonymous": "The Aryan, who admits from the very beginning that the gods are unjust, does not cherish such a passionate desire to achieve worldly goods. He does not take the pleasures of life so seriously. Carried away by his chimera of the afterlife (only such a chimera can advance to great deeds), the Aryan builds his house for eternity, while the Semite wants the house to stand as long as he lives". What else does the Semite "want"? Here it is: "The Great Anonymous of the captivity is undoubtedly one of the heroes of human history. He is intoxicated with justice. His image of the servant of Yagweh shows us a picture of self-denial, brought to martyrdom, and **at the same time** he sees the height of well-being in a rich life and longevity. His city, built of gold and precious stones, dominates the whole world and exploits it for its own benefit. To enjoy the house he has built, the tree he has planted - this is the ideal to which this humanist comes. " As a summary, Renan writes the formula: "The Semite believes too much in God; the Aryan believes too much in the eternal man". He understands that he is talking nonsense, since he does not know what the "Aryan" thought. He knows what the Islamist thinks, or rather is obliged to think. He has already told us this, see the previous paragraph. Therefore, he adds an explanation to the "formula": "Both concepts were necessary in order to create civilization. The Semite gave God; the Aryan gave the immortality of the soul. Until now, no means have been invented to do without these postulates".

The main thing I want to draw attention to is the addition of the "thoughts" of a Semite, almost transformed into an Islamite, to an **ancient** Aryan. After all, if this were so, then how would Renan explain the same feelings of contempt for death for the benefits of the afterlife, for example, among the Islamites of the Algerian, Egyptian, Ethiopian, and so on, who did not even sit close to the Aryans? (Renan considers the Afghans to be Aryans, I remind you). And when the Afghan Taliban smashed ancient Aryan deities with

cannons in 2001, they thereby proved that they do not even remember Aryan morality. And their entire "afterlife" is entirely and completely of Islamic origin. Therefore, Renan, using "Aryans", thereby commits a direct forgery.

Second. It is not the Aryan who "does not have a passionate desire for worldly goods, the pleasures of life, carried away by the afterlife", but the Muslim. And it was Islam that moved them to such “great deeds” as the destruction of skyscrapers in New York. But “to attribute anything to oneself is the most terrible crime” – I quote Judaism, which is once again divided into two halves, which is almost Islam. “To attribute anything to oneself is the most terrible crime”. “The merciless destruction of all objects of idolatry and absolute iconoclasm”, with the help of guns, I will add. What kind of ancient “Arism” is this? It is still Judaism, for “he who says: by my own strength I have brought myself all this, he is as if robbing a part of the glory of Yagweh”. But already strongly overgrown with Islam.

And if we speak frankly, then Renan is lying that “the Semite believes in God too much”. The Muslim believes in him much more. And Renan is lying that “the Aryan believes too much in the eternal man”. He believes that in “that” life he will be a bug, or a stone, or a scarlet flower, but not an eternal little man. There is a big difference.

And the “picture of self-denial brought to martyrdom” of true Jews, not Muslims, cannot be compared, as a continuation, with “the height of well-being in a rich life and longevity”, with “a city built of gold and precious stones”, “domination over the whole world and its exploitation for one’s own benefit”. But Renan does this, he connects “fire and flame” with water.

Finally, the slogan “The Semite gave God; the Aryan gave immortality of the soul. Until now, no means have been invented to do without these postulates” is the most imperialistic, the most vile and disgusting of all slogans that have ever sounded or been displayed on a wall. The Semite really gave us a god, taking advantage of our childhood, putting into a children's toy - TNT, or rather, a mutagenic drug, or simply - plutonium, the half-life of which is 40 thousand years. Half-life!

They invented the One Yahweh for themselves out of necessity, to contain in a fist the fingers scattered around the world. And why do we need him, always pushing in lines, tripping over each other, locking ourselves in our huts from each other, having piled up Kremlin walls? How good it was when you go to steal, praying to one god, and defend yourself from theft with the help of another. Going on a date, you ask Aphrodite, returning from a date, you take in your hands the sledgehammer of Hephaestus. You pick grapes with Artemis, and "walk" in the company of Bacchus or Satyr. It was even better when, going fishing, you locked your wife in a wigwam, going hunting - you washed yourself. If you wanted to annoy your neighbor, you didn't shoot him with a bow, but just threw your fallen tooth into his garden, or pee on his fence. They said it helps. So the best times were not even under polytheism, but under magic.

It was indeed the Jews who gave us one God. But with a specific, far-reaching goal: to create an empire on the whole earth under the control of yet another fool, whose actions they would control, invisibly and inaudibly for the rest of the fools, that is, you and me. But, having fought among themselves over spheres of influence over the main fool of the Earth, they were still forced to go to a number of faiths under the leadership of one god in each faith, but with different names. And I think there is no need to praise the Jews for this. They have many other things, for example, alphabetic writing, science, art, for the invention of which they really should be praised.

The Jews simply needed one god, and he took root among them. But we do not need him, there is no need for him, he was forcibly given to us. Prove it? Elementary. We have few believers, and even those who exist, believe in both God and magic at the same time, even more in magic. A believer goes to church, but forgot his wallet at home, and has no money to buy candles. So he is afraid to return, and when he returns, he looks in the mirror before leaving the house a second time, so that the return does not have a bad effect on the purpose for which he left the first time. And if he accidentally meets a black cat running across the road, he will not go to church, because he firmly knows that it is useless: there will be no luck. Returning from church, he will run to a witch, to bewitch his beloved, to fix his radiculitis, to remove some kind of "damage". And the gypsies in crowded places have not yet died of hunger, they barely have time to tell fortunes for us. And when Christmas comes, they tell fortunes with felt boots, and with wax, and with coffee grounds, and with notes under the pillow, and the devil knows what else. And all this is magic! Christ is nothing compared to it, even though he is now under the protection of the Russian state officials. And they keep telling us, supposedly, "relics of the past". Well, these relics have already outlived Christ, they have outlived the communists, and they will outlive democracy. We don't know what will happen to us tomorrow as a whole, and to each of us individually, but we really want to know, we simply need to look into tomorrow.

Now about death and "that" life. Even the Australian aborigines, American Indians, the Far Eastern Ainu, and so on, all believe in the afterlife in one form or another, read Frazer. And how did they figure out this higher mathematics without the Aryans? And the Jews, according to Renan, don't believe it. It can't be. I'm just too lazy to dig around, otherwise I would have proven it with quotes from other authors. Actually, maybe less. They are smarter, so they want to live well in this world and not just scrape by in the next. So Renan thought that the Jews don't believe in the afterlife at all, they want to get everything they want. And I thought about this problem properly, and without any "passionarities", "torsion forces multiplied by "other" fields" and other high-minded tricks, and I decided that the afterlife was invented as a warning. As we saw, the people were not very concerned with believing in one god. So he was given the lethal force to rule over us after the death of the brain. It is impossible to prove anything "for" or "against", and fear, as they say, is always with us. And there is no other reason.

This is where the one god united with death, but he cannot avoid it either. Someday.

The First National Socialism, which Renan mistook for Socialism.

The Israelis, whom Renan had consigned to the dustbin of history, had in fact lived peacefully alongside the Judeans, and were making their lives better and better by their joint efforts. And here, for the first time, Renan felt that soup and flies in the same bowl were not quite the right thing. This is how he put it: "Whether rightly or wrongly, we do not want the state to interfere in the moral, social, and religious questions of our lives. Love of one's neighbor and law seem to us to be two completely different things. Perhaps it is better that they should be strictly separated at the present time, but their union was undoubtedly once fruitful".

I can't stand it when someone, with the exception of the Jewish elite, dares to think that they live among complete fools. Especially if they consider, for example, Australian aborigines, northern peoples, Indians and other people who have historically chosen a slightly different way of life. Past generations, even the whole bunch of Nobel laureates, cannot be considered fools either. But Renan does. And this is his huge minus. It led him to National Socialism. Well, how can you say that for those fools who lived 1000 years ago, the

divine liturgy and jurisprudence can be mixed so that there is complete arbitrariness, but in Renan's time this can no longer be done. That is why he died, never having understood the full beauty of the true Deuteronomy, supported by the "era of judges", that is why he talked such utter nonsense that angered me so much.

The chapter from which I have just quoted is called "The First Appearance of Socialism", among the Judeans, of course. In support of his apology "for socialism", which the Jews themselves had not thought of, Renan quotes Yagweh himself: "There will no longer be poor among you, for Yagweh will bless you if only you listen to him. You will lend to many nations, and you yourselves will not feel the need to borrow from others, you will rule over many nations, and no one will rule over you. If there is a poor man **among you**, one of your brothers, in one of **your** cities or in one of your villages, do not harden your hearts, do not close your hands **for your** poor brother. But open your hands to him and lend him whatever he needs, as much as he needs. Beware of having in your hearts the indecent thought: "The seventh year (the year of forgiveness of debts) is approaching", and of looking unkindly **at your** poor brother and not lending to him anything - for fear that he will call upon Yagweh against you, and that you will commit a sin. Rather lend to him, and let your heart not grieve over it, for this Yagweh, your Lord, will bless you in your labors and in all your undertakings. For the poor will always be in the land. Therefore I command you: "Open your hands to your poor and needy **in your land**".

If this is socialism, then what is National Socialism? Of course, Renan did not live to see Hitler's National Socialism, but that means absolutely nothing. The real socialists had long since settled in Renan's homeland, even before he was born. And they were the ones who said that all nations should be equal, as should each individual among these nations. But that is not the main thing, although Hitler could be proud of it. The main thing is that how could Renan not notice that this passage is a masterpiece of the most elegant speech **of his time**? It smells so strongly of modernity here that it is impossible not to feel it. And even if they hide this phrase three times in the most ancient "papyrus", it will still stick out from there like an awl from a sack. In other words, this is the same retrospective insert for the youth that I spoke about a little earlier. And the most important thing is that the Jews have become insolent. There are no "shoots of Islam in the depths of Judaism" here. This is Judaism of the purest water. Moreover, Judaism, tested by experience, colossal achievements in the field of "living at someone else's expense", insolent and undisguised Judaism, carrying its insolence like a banner. And quite recent, since I don't like specific dates.

For this, Judaism, as the quotation was "improved", received its numerous "expulsions", increasingly severe, Jewish ghettos, and, as a crown of thorns, the "Holocaust". This is precisely why Hitler exterminated the Jews, because they, had they lived, would never have allowed him to use their given ideology. As the saying goes, what goes around comes around. He who takes the sword will perish by the sword. And to this day, Jews shudder, especially in the press and on TV, as soon as they hear about neo-nazism.

But I am not writing about this for the Jews, but for today's Americans. Of course, their ideology is far from the Jewish ideology that I just presented with the quotation from Renan, it doesn't even come close to it. But as for the self-confidence to solve world problems with a stick, that is exactly what I had in mind. Be more modest, boys. You are still so young. Although, in my opinion, you are reorganizing the world correctly.

"The end of Israel will coincide with the moment of the highest flowering of Greece"

Introduction

I took these words from Renan, from his "History of the Israeli people" (p. 592). I have already lost count of who the Jews have not been under. My previous article ended with the Persian rule, it was the tenth. The Greeks, then, are the eleventh, and the Romans are still ahead. They do not allow the poor Jews to live alone. Renan praises the Persians very much, they gave great freedom to their Israelite slaves, such freedom that they began to write in Hebrew, although it was called Aramaic. Here is how he describes it: "Ezra and Nehemiah lived in the age of Pericles; they are contemporaries of Herodotus, Aeschylus, Socrates and Hippocrates. While Israel joyfully bears the yoke of the Achaemenids, while Yagweh is completely absorbed in the care of turning the heart of the great king to the good of his people, while the Jew is proud of the title of cupbearer, lackey or spy of the Persian king, Greece wages a life-and-death struggle, defeats Darius, Xerxes and Artaxerxes and saves civilization.

All this is sheer empty talk. And not only in Renan, but in general the empty talk of official history, which we have learned since childhood and now cannot part with. Like with our own skin, our favorite drink, heroin or some other devilry.

I have always said that history should not study wars, it is better to study peoples, their way of life, customs, trade. But history does not study this, for example, in trade they study only spices, furs and silks, while the main items of trade are salt, timber and slaves. But I started with wars. Now tell me that such a fig as Greece, and not the current one in area, but several islands and the Peloponnese, conquered everything up to India. Is it realistic, even if it had an atomic bomb? That's why I won't even mention wars in this article.

For me, the engine of history is trade and the Jews who invented it. And don't think that trade is easy to invent. Maybe you think that it's easy to invent alphabetic writing? Most people, not counting the Jews who are part of them, have a genetic aversion to trade. You hear almost every day that they say, I'd rather die of hunger than go sell. And to trade, you need to know the language very well and, most importantly, be able to use it. And preferably not just one, if you live, for example, in Dagestan, where there are over forty languages. Without writing, you can do everything: hunt, fish, grow something, even declare your love, with your eyes alone. But in trade, you absolutely cannot do without writing. And since trade was invented by the Jews, then alphabetic writing is also their invention. And this invention is so great that you can’t invent it even twice, let alone for every nation.

Having invented trade and alphabetic writing (everyone invented hieroglyphs, but they are not writing), the Jews moved through the nations along the shores of the Arabian Sea in different directions, to the east and to the west. A long time or a short time later, these two tribes of Israel found themselves opposite each other, without even recognizing each other at first. Some in Persia, which I examined in the article "Two Sides of the Coin", others - on the Bosphorus. I will begin with these in this article. And everything that I have said here without any evidence has actually been proven, but you need to read my other works. There is such a heap of evidence that I don't even know where to put it. For twenty megabytes of solid text, even without pictures, which mostly gobble up megabytes.

However, I must tell my version of this story, because it is fundamentally different from the generally accepted one. So, the Eastern tribe of Jews ended up in Persia for their trade affairs, and divided as follows. One part, led by their Yahweh and the true Deuteronomy, having quarreled with the other part, went to trade further north and organize the Khazar Khaganate, and the part that remained in Persia, with the aim

of penetrating the Persian authorities, corrected their religion, and Islam was born. In this Islam they mixed with the natives and became Persians, a nation with a very high ancient culture.

The Western tribe of Jews marched through Ethiopia and Egypt to Alexandria, from Alexandria they spread out in both directions along the southern shore of the Mediterranean Sea. The peculiarity of this tribe, as well as the Eastern one, was the division into Judeans and Israelites. The Judeans did not change their religion and with the help of Yahweh they all moved and moved forward, absorbing into the pores of the peoples and trading. The Israelites tried to penetrate the local aboriginal power, adjusting their religion to the demands of power over the population, so that it would be obedient and work for free for the government. In the end, the Islam of the Eastern tribe penetrated to Gibraltar, since their division into Judeans and Israelites occurred later. And the vanguard of the Western Judeans finally reached the Bosphorus. The Eastern Judeans, as I said, began to create the Khazar Khaganate on the extraction and transit of salt, and the Western Judeans, leaving behind the Islam of the Israelites, settled on the Bosphorus.

A stream of salt, timber and slaves went through the Bosphorus to Mediterranean Europe, all of this was from the future Russia. Well, naturally, and a few other goods, small things - silks, porcelain and other exotic goods for the rich. The first thing the Jews did on the Bosphorus was to build triple high walls, stretch an iron chain across the Bosphorus, and wind the end of it around a winch hidden behind these triple walls. And before each ship passing the strait, this chain was raised, blocking the way, and they demanded money or part of the goods. As you understand, for the whole of Byzantium (that was the name of the city, and there was no Byzantine Empire) about ten workers were needed to turn the winch. Everyone else used this labor, or rather, its consequences in the form of duties, which were appointed right from the ceiling. If you do not want to pay, you will stand in front of the raised chain forever. The Jews are forever near water, although they came out of the desert, descending from a lifeless plateau into the coastal lowland of the Arabian Sea.

It must be said that the shores of the Bosphorus were not deserted before the arrival of the Jews. Here, as everywhere, lived people, local tribes, exactly the same as in the just-discussed Persia, without culture and education. But they loved the sea very much, since their whole life was connected with it. In those days, it was customary for people to hide. The plains were deserted. The entire population of the countless tribes gathered in the mountains, where it was easy to hide, for example, in the Caucasus. The coastal tribes hid on the islands, inaccessible to anyone except them. Thus, Venice was formed in ancient times precisely because the shallow, warm lagoons were full of fish spawning here, and the lagoon islands and peninsulas served as housing. When some wandering steppe bandits approached, the people climbed into the boats and sailed away about a hundred meters. The nomads waited two or three days, and then left. There was nothing special to take from the huts, and the people took the bowls and cups with them into the boats. Therefore, the countless number of islands in the Ionian and other future Greek seas were inhabited, but the mainland was not.

The Jews despised these peoples because they had not thought of organizing a customs office with a chain on the Bosphorus. But they were quickly given jobs: transporting goods. They paid for them here and sold them there. That is, the trade economy was in their hands, and the workers were local tribes, who quickly became Greeks. Since the Jews everywhere accept local languages, they had to work hard: expand their vocabulary and create a "Greek" script from Hebrew. Just as the Eastern tribe did in Persia. This is how "Greek" history began, covering the Black Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean. Of course, there never was any Byzantine Empire. It was simply a trading area, which historians later took for an empire. Of course,

there were some legends, but they were so disfigured by "Greek" authors that nothing in them is now understandable. Moreover, most of them were composed almost in our days, and on pure fantasy, using elements of ancient legends, randomly mixed.

Now, it seems, we can begin the Greek-Jewish history described by Renan.

Alexander the Great rules over the Jews

I have repeated hundreds of times in my works that, according to our stupid history, the Jews are always under someone's rule (the Greeks are the eleventh). While in reality they themselves are the rulers of everything and everyone, but completely unnoticed by historians, since they have never fought, and historians only write about wars. But now, it seems, people have already begun to understand, but not modern historians, who are occupied not with history, but with politics, that the Jews are the center of the universe. And I say this completely seriously.

I never deal with conquests and various wars, since they simply did not exist. There were predatory campaigns like the Cossack-robber Stenka Razin in Persia, but these are not wars. This is a parody of war, embellished as much as possible. But historians believe in wars as in God, so let's listen to Renan: "Thanks to one of the extremely rare sudden impulses in the history of mankind, Greece in 333 set out on a campaign against the entire East and after ten years of war won a complete victory. The vast empire of the Achaemenids disappeared like a fata morgana, the Greek army penetrated Bactria and India. In Asia Minor, in Syria, in Egypt, the seeds of Hellenism were sown, which quickly sprouted and bore rich fruit. The axis of world movement shifted, just as it happened two hundred years earlier after the victory of Cyrus. Now physical force was undoubtedly at the service of reason. The harsh, rude Macedonians, who, under the leadership of Alexander, carried out a campaign that can only be compared to the campaigns of the Great French Revolution or the Napoleonic campaigns…" Enough.

The darker the question, the more stupid the answer, the more pathos the historians have. This is the law of historical nature, based on lies. What would you say if I wrote that kindergarten #179, as a result of an “extremely rare sudden impulse in the history of mankind”, left Moscow in such-and-such a year and returned three to five years later, bringing the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee a gift (like Yermak), for example, Indonesia? And all the countries on the way there would disappear like a “fata morgana”? You can think the same thing when reading the above quote. Look at today’s Greece. Where could all this have come from? And where did it go? It is the poorest rocky country in Europe, scraping by on bread and kvass, and living off rich tourists, fugitive bandits, and offshore businesses. There you can’t even feed the army of Macedonia until it learns to win and eat the bread it has conquered.

Further: “Asia Minor, liberated from the Persian satraps, became a colony of Greece in the cultural sense”. Can you imagine Turkey as a colony of Greece today? And why could it be a colony then? Because Renan wrote so?

Let’s move on to the Nile Delta: “The Nile Valley continued to sleep its age-old sleep, continued to carve its temples, its rocks, but in these creations it showed the Greek taste that had taken root in it. The Delta, in any case, became one of the strongest positions of Hellenism. If the Tigris and Euphrates basin was soon recaptured by the East, then it must be said that the Arsacids – the further, the more recognized the cultural superiority of Greece”.

Can you imagine? Kindergarten No. 179, returning from conquered Indonesia by a roundabout route, conquered the Nile Delta out of boredom. Just don't forget, please, because I forgot myself, that Napoleon, crushing Egypt with a platoon of soldiers, had guns and cannons against Egyptian sabers. But Macedonian had none of that. There was a club against a club, a bow against a bow and a dart against a dart. And the Egyptians fled not from Napoleon's grenadiers, but from fear of their iron things that spewed fire.

The Nile "sleeping" valley was already under Islam, when it was impossible to breathe without the will of Allah, and no one needed it. There was nothing to trade there. For the same reason, the "Tigris and Euphrates basin" was not "won back", but simply there was nothing for the trading "Greeks" to do there. It, too, had already fallen asleep under Islam. Only the sciences were still glimmering in the palaces. But as for Alexandria, firstly, there were salt deposits there and, secondly, it was a strategic port for the entire southern Mediterranean trade route. And no one conquered anything. The city of Byzantium simply collected customs duties and, when they had accumulated in large quantities, used them for trade, hired “Greeks” to sail from Trebizond to Gibraltar and transport goods, without any war. That is why “the Jewish colony in Alexandria quickly reached a flourishing state”, and the Jews began to have “greater dignity outside their own country than in Palestine (replace Palestine with Byzantium), where they felt themselves to be too much of a master”.

Here Renan began to lie again: “With their (the Jews’) ability for languages, they quickly mastered the Greek language and began to write in it quite purely. Their pleasant faces made them very welcome visitors in the houses of rich Greeks”. I will correct Renan before your eyes, although he knows better than you that he is lying. After all, he is not you, he knew both Greek and Hebrew. So, aleph, bet and gimmel are respectively a bull, a house and a camel in Hebrew, which corresponds to the "Greek" letters alpha, beta and gamma. But in the "Greek" language they do not mean anything specific, just letters. So, it was the Jews who gave the "Greeks" writing. And Renan is lying that the Jews began to write in Greek "quite purely”. It is just that the Jews, as they do everywhere, switched to a set of local languages, giving them writing and most of their own "trade" words, and this "Greek" language spread on ships from Trebizond to Spain, not forgetting to drop in to Alexandria, which Renan is talking about now. Although, I will stop, he is talking about the war again. I will just say that it was not the “rich Greeks” who received the “poor Jews” in their houses, but the opposite: the rich Jews received the Greeks who had successfully sailed on their behalf.

I will also say, before I forget, that the flourishing of the "Greek" sciences and arts in Greece and Byzantium, which is essentially the same thing, was caused not by the "Greek genius", but by simple down-to-earth trade profits. I will not tire of repeating that at that time, labor productivity was such that almost all labor was spent on food alone. Trade and loan profits were so great that it became possible to support an entire army of scientists, artists and painters of all genres. Just remember that bank credit is now 5-10, and then it was at least 200 percent, while trade profits soared to heights that are now completely unimaginable. And I have not yet mentioned the iron chain across the Bosphorus, which practically did not require any labor, and money poured out as if from that notorious "horn of plenty". Maybe that is where it came from. That is where the Greek phenomenon "grows" from. If it were not so, today's Greece would continue in the same vein.

Alexandrian Mishmash

Renan describes the flourishing of Alexandria as if on "Greek" principles. And at the same time, the conversation is not so much about the "Greeks" as about the Jews. Moreover, Jerusalem is strangely

forgotten. Here: "In Jerusalem and its immediate environs, Hellenization was weak". And a little further: "Many (Jewish - mine) cities, on the other hand, out of servility changed their old names for the names of the cities of the new conquerors. The entire geographical aspect changed". And a little further: "It is remarkable, however, that the old names did not perish". Somehow all this is vague and unclear: Did they change the names after all, or did they remain? Was Jerusalem Hellenized or not?

According to Renan, Alexandria was founded by Macedonian, but 20 pages later Flavius is quoted, and it turns out that Jews had lived there long before Macedonian, and just as well as in Persia: "Thus Flavius is proud that the Alexandrian sons of his people lived "in close relations with the kings" (I suppose, the Egyptian ones – mine), he claims that during the reign of Philometor and Cleopatra, Jews dominated the court and that, following his expression, "these two sovereigns entrusted their kingdom to the Jews". Here we should also drag in "ancient Romans", since Cleopatra went to Rome for love, but Renan omits this. In general, it would be nice: the queen went to her lover, and in her place left a Jew "to perform duties". All this resembles not a coherent story, but a madman, randomly shouting out incoherent and meaningless words.

Look here: "Jewish vanity surrounded these first steps of Hellenistic Judaism with such a fabric of falsifications that it is very difficult to distinguish the apocryphal from the reality in this dark section of Jewish history. It seems true that it was during the reign of Philometor that the Alexandrine Jews came into close contact with Hellenism, that it was then that the spirit of competition took possession of them, and in imitation of the Greeks they began to write in Greek". But I have already spoken about the bull, the house and the camel. And Renan still insists: "The most superficial similarities were enough for them to identify biblical episodes with episodes of Greek mythology or poorly understood data of ancient erudition".

Generally speaking, Renan could have guessed that it was not the "ancient Greeks" who had jumped out like a jack-in-the-box who wrote, but the Jews who had already grown up, so that they had already begun to write poetry, but he insisted: "Demetrius, Cleodos, Aristeas or Malchius still retained, apparently, a certain seriousness in their supposedly historical efforts. Eupolemus and Artapan (or at least the Jew hiding under this strange name) knew no bounds in their charlatan inventions".

Why did he do this to them? Because they do not fit into his "concept". Is it possible to do this to a French and Russian academician? Even if they lived 2000 years before him, they should still not get under Renan's feet: "Artapan tells us that the Egyptians received all their knowledge and all their institutions from the Jews. Abraham taught King Pharatotes astrology, Joseph rendered the Egyptians an infinite number of services. The most famous Egyptian temples were built by the sons of Jacob. The entire Egyptian cult is the creation of Moses; it is he who is the Museum of the Greeks, who was the teacher of Orpheus, he invented the art of navigation, the art of building houses, the art of war, created philosophy, divided the country into thirty-six nomes, taught how to worship God, taught the priests hieroglyphs".

Read it again. This is exactly what I never tire of repeating: the Jews came to Egypt to trade, and made it a decent country for that time. And when their "exodus" took place, the country turned into what modern Israel did with it on the Sinai Peninsula with the help of American tanks. They couldn't even build a dam, they had to call the Russians, who were also not strong in science, not counting guns. And who built the Suez Canal for them? The British. By the way, Greece will soon become the same, once the Jews leave.

But Renan still doesn't like it. Of course, he didn't know about the war on the Sinai Peninsula, but he certainly knew about the Suez Canal. Therefore, he continues: "These childish inventions were sometimes

set out in verse. The histories of Jerusalem and Shechem were written in bad hexameters. A certain Ezekiel composed a miserable tragedy, the plot of which was the exodus from Egypt". But perhaps this "miserable tragedy" is precisely what history lacked. And "bad hexameters" speak of greater antiquity than the "good hexameters" of those whom Renan likes? And it is not for nothing that one can say: Renan, are you angry? Then you are wrong. And here is something else interesting. "When the work was finished, Ptolemy gave everyone expensive gifts, granted the Jews wonderful privileges. "Everyone is satisfied". This is the work Renan is talking about, which he likes. And now, with the documents in hand, it is practically impossible to speak of anything definite. Especially since three pages later Renan again goes on the offensive against the "compilers" of what does not exist now: "One circumstance, however, greatly facilitated the circulation of these inventions among the public. The great compiler Alexander Polyhistor, who lived about 75 B.C. and wrote on all sorts of subjects, also took up the Jews and wrote Περί Ιουδαίων. This Περί Ιουδαίων was a collection of indiscriminately made extracts. Alexander was not happy in his choice; he attacked that weak literature of which we have just spoken. Almost all the apocryphal data repeated about the Jews were borrowed from Polyhistor. Thanks to him, or, if you prefer, thanks to Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius, who repainted his compilation, this literature was saved from well-deserved oblivion".

One thing can be understood from this hornless phrase: history was rewritten by each new ruler, as is still being done today. For example, Russian history, it seems, is already being adjusted to suit president Putin, and the ABC book has already been adjusted. And each time, along with the "holy water", the baby is thrown out of the font. I also know Eusebius, I even dedicated a special chapter to him in my book "The Mysterious Russian Soul against the Background of World Jewish History", he is quite the fruit. In my opinion, instead of the puppy "Constantine the Great", it was he who ruled. Therefore, at the present time, history needs only absolutely common sense, uniting into a single whole a pile of disordered events. This is exactly what I do.

By the way, one can understand one more thing: in general, historians, like Renan, do not like to remember Polyhistor. This is also not accidental. I have no doubt that in his work, some things are colored, emphasized, and some are thrown out. But reading it, like reading Renan, can also yield some information that got into the work through carelessness or stupidity. After all, I prove my version of history with Renan's words. The most important thing is that all the information is available, and even more importantly, that all of it, without exception, fits into the concept. And when information is thrown out or declared "bad hexameters", this immediately raises suspicions about the author's honesty. And even the fact that Renan denigrates Polyhistor for collecting "indiscriminately made extracts" is bad, but Polyhistor did it well, in my opinion. There must be two histories: a conceptual one, when events are given a complete logical meaning. This is the author's story. And a story like an anthology, where events are simply folded, like useless pieces of paper in a wastebasket for those who want to sort them out. This wastebasket must be canonical, let everything lie there. And there can be as many author's stories as there are authors themselves. And one more thing. God forbid that one of the conceptualist authors should become the most important, the most "foundational". Then the story will be over. However, I have digressed again.

The most important conclusion from all that has been stated here is that none of these were "ancient Greeks". These were Jews from Constantinople, who spread out across the Mediterranean. They arrived in Constantinople not being poor, but they ate so much there that they became super-rich. And they began to expand in this form across the Mediterranean again. Even Renan indirectly confirms this: "The poems that were attributed to Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Philemon, Menander, Diphilus, Orpheus, Hesiod,

Homer, Linus are more or less entirely fabricated. It is believed, and not without probability, that this entire hoax was created by Pseudo-Hecatels". I will not argue, although for one it is too much. But the famous Poggio Bracciolini also did a lot during the time of Cosimo de' Medici (see my other works). It's hard to believe in such "labor productivity", although he had a whole "Platonic" academy headed by Ficchino at his disposal. And both of them delved into the bottomless bank of the Medici as if it were their own pocket.

So, it's time for the Jews to change their "master-conqueror"

It's the turn of the Seleucid Turks to reign over the Jews. It seems, if I'm not mistaken in the count, this is the twelfth "captivity". Renan's poetry is as always at its best: "The clearest voice of an Israelite that has come down to us from this era is the voice of the Jerusalemite Jesus, son of Sirach..". But the footnote to this poetry is in sad prose: "The Hebrew text is lost. The Greek translation, made by the author's grandson about 130 B.C., is very bad. The Syriac translation, made, like the Greek, from the Hebrew, is in many cases better than the Greek and Latin". The Editor continues this footnote, and even sadder: "The Hebrew text of Sirach was found in 1896 in fragments brought from the Khair (Cairo? - my) Genizah by S. Schechter, Neubauer and Kadlei and was published by Peters in 1905 and by Smend in 1906". That is, after Renan's death.

It's a strange thing. As soon as there is a lack of trust in the writings of historians, immediately "confirmations" are found, and under the most fantastic circumstances, either on some island in a monastery forgotten not only by God but also by people, or in some cave, like the Qumran "scrolls", or somewhere else in the middle of nowhere. Moreover, the illiterate shepherds and other Bedouins who find them never use their finds to light a fire or stove, as always happens, for example, with old newspapers, but, on the contrary, encouraged by some inner spirit, they drag them to scientists God knows how, having appeared completely "by accident". Historians simply do not keep count of these "accidents", but should number them in order. And then they would immediately feel ashamed. Especially if they presented these "accidents" to mathematicians, specialists in probability theory. I think the probability of finding what is required has long since exceeded one, which is impossible according to strict science. Even one is impossible.

Besides, there is some confusion. Jesus, son of Sirach, possessed a "clear voice". And in a cave called the "Khair Geniza", they found "fragments of the text" of Father Sirach himself. The "translation" of all this was done by Jesus' grandson, Sirach's great-grandson. What the hell, even though they talk about a "holy" matter. At least they could have said what the Khair Geniza is?

I am not nitpicking out of boredom. The fact is that this "grandson" writes very interesting things: "In general, the son of Sirach has little confidence in the virtue of women. He does not love or respect them. Allowing for exceptions, he still finds them intolerable, quarrelsome, gluttonous, loud, talkative. They must be guarded with caution. The surest thing is to keep them under lock and key. The misfortunes of human life come from a woman. The son of Sirach has already concluded from the first stories of Genesis that death entered the world through a woman".

The fact is that in modern Judaism and even in the legislation of Israel this quote is the law. The same is true in Islam and Islamic countries. Meanwhile, the Christian Old Testament and the Jewish Torah are full of women of the highest intelligence, devotion and self-sacrifice, real heroines. And most men look somewhat "unfinished" against their background. Especially since Solomon himself is a woman transformed into a

man. And if they had not been there, had they not saved, had they not taught the Jews wisdom and reason countless times, the Jews themselves would not exist.

The eastern tribe came to Persia either with the newly born patriarchy, or it had already developed there. Patriarchy was needed because the main supplier of goods in the family became a male merchant, and the woman, burdened with children, was forced to sit at home. And the fact that such strong means of suppressing women's will and power were used against them, just points to a coup. Troublemakers and revolutionaries were always hanged, but women, still in control of the situation, did not hang their faithful, they understood that from now on this is how they should live. And men, having taken the power voluntarily given to them, began to mock women in revenge, precisely for their voluntariness, just like Yeltsin mocked Gorbachev. Read the Bible, dwelling longer on women, and you will understand that this is exactly how it is.

This once again proves that Islam was born before Christianity.

The vanguard of the Western tribe of true Judeans (the Israelites remained in Egypt to reign) came to the Bosphorus still with matriarchy, as shown by the Byzantine empresses, all of whom, without exception, were not later converted into men (see the book mentioned). And also the fact that the "Greek" and "Roman" mother goddesses were the main ones, and male gods were, until very recently, like doormats (ibid.). Moreover, I have proven that this matriarchy existed until Cosimo de' Medici himself, the founder of Catholicism (ibid.), until the first edition of the Malleus in 1486, which was then published more often than the Bible itself for 100 years.

Therefore, only Cosimo de' Medici, who convened the Ferrara-Florence Council in 1438, which is the beginning of Catholicism, needed the "works" of all those dads, grandfathers and grandsons with the surname Sirach. And it was he, Cosimo de' Medici, who "bought out" from the Turk Mohammed II, the official conqueror of Constantinople (1453), most of the "ancient manuscripts". And manuscripts that were supposedly Christian, and therefore "unnecessary" to the Islamist Mohammed. Do you understand now why Renan sent the Jews back into slavery, this time to the "Seleucids"? And do you understand why such nonsense is happening with the "translation", in particular, of these "works" of the Sirach series?

Because, having "bought out" the manuscripts, Cosimo immediately began to prepare the "collapse of the matriarchy", but did not have time, he died in 1464. According to official history, it looks like this. Under the pseudonym Malleus, two Dominican monks spoke out: Johann Sprenger, dean of the University of Cologne (Germany), and Heinrich Kraemer, professor of theology at the University of Salzburg (Austria). In 1484, Pope Innocent VIII signed the bull Summis Desiderantes, in which he "regretted the development of witchcraft in Germany and authorized Sprenger and Kraemer to eradicate it". And "witches" were continuously burned at the stake for 200 years.

By the way, religious service is divided into two parts, the actual service to God (liturgy), and service to people (deaconry). So, at the dawn of Christianity, deaconesses were exclusively women. Now, it is not clear what a deacon is? And how does he differ from a priest? Isn't it the same as yelling at the top of his lungs? And in those days it was clear - service to people, not to God himself, including sexual service. So that it would be easier for them to believe in the mother goddess. And then they got confused during the transition to patriarchy, and after the fires.

Let me return to Renan. "The triumph of Jesus, son of Sirach, lies in the realm of bourgeois morality... <…>...he not only stands for strict monogamy, although the Torah allows polygamy, any easy attitude on the part of a man seems worthy of condemnation to him. The family rests on respect for the father... <…>Here the special virtue of humility is already indicated. A calm, moderate man, well-bred, modest in his speech, not swearing, never uttering a rude word, yielding to his opponent so as not to enter into an argument, will be the master of the world".

Such a person will be a slave, Mr. Renan! And this is precisely what the "emerging" Christianity demands. I put "emerging" in quotes because none of this is in the Torah. There is not even polygamy. Only kings had many wives according to the Torah, and without any religious justification, according to the principle: it is forbidden, but if you really want to, then you can. And Renan took all this from half the Torah, when it was already either Jewish or Muslim, standing with its legs spread wide. That is why it is good to "find" ancient manuscripts in caves. In one cave you will find about snow, that it is white, and in another, if necessary, that it is black.

Conclusion

I am tired of all this. Soon there will be Essenes, Pharisees and "scribes". So, Christ must be born. Someone has to oppress them. And since there is Christ, the Roman Empire is necessary. Just like the previous "captivations". In my opinion, this will be the thirteenth "captivity" - the devil's dozen. And then the Jews will be dispersed across countries and peoples, although they know perfectly well that they are eternal "migrants", which is why they are still alive. And not only alive, in my opinion, there are now no fewer of them than the Chinese. And they live on average much better than you and me, also - on average. But we should not envy them, not be angry with them, not generate anti-Semitism in ourselves, but learn from them.

I am finishing because the last quote from Renan makes it perfectly clear what Christianity is. Therefore, the Pharisees with the Essenes and scribes, including the Roman Empire, are no longer necessary. Especially since there was no Roman Empire. There was the banker Cosimo Medici, who concentrated all the money of Europe in his cellars, including Kievan and Muscovite Rus. And his descendants - the Roman popes. Nothing more.

March 12, 2002

About what I have not yet formulated in my works

Here I would like to briefly formulate the answer to the question: why and how did the notorious Eastern and Western civilizations come about? From the totality of all my previous works, you know that the eastern tribe of the trading tribe went into the power of the local tribes, which they combed for their trading affairs. And ultimately assimilated with them on the basis of Islam. But maintaining itself in the elite of these peoples. This is precisely why Islam spread from Indonesia to Gibraltar in a continuous strip. Initially under the guise of the successful construction of the Tower of Babel. But without the communications of the present time, such a state could not exist for long. Having received a decent, verbose, "commercial" human speech instead of monosyllabic mooing on the subject of satisfying lust, and then writing, the peoples, but mainly their local kings, began to develop more or less autonomously. Due to the imperfection of communications. In the Bible, this appears as a "confusion of languages", after which it became

impossible to continue building the Tower of Babel. Thus, the eastern world of different countries with the same religion was formed. A world with a harsh cannibalistic rule, to which I dedicated a special article.

The true Deuteronomy of Moses never triumphed in this world, and it probably never arose in this environment. Let me remind you that the true Deuteronomy is the division of religion and morality into different bins. Religion is for identifying oneself among one's own kind with the help of Yahweh, morality is for legislation and law-abidingness. I have written everywhere that in order to conquer minds, the elite of the eastern tribe returned to the First Law, which united religion and morality into one heap, from which both Islam and Christianity grew, which were initially indistinguishable from each other. Now, upon reflection, I have come to the conclusion that Deuteronomy did not even arise in this environment. The First Law smoothly grew into Islam and Christianity of the eastern type. It is not for nothing that Isa-Jesus is even related, not to mention “teaching” is close to the prophet Mohammed.

The western tribe of the trading tribe did not grow up on the border of Yemen and Saudi Arabia, where this very trading tribe was formed, but much later. Then, when the language and knowledge of the Jews spread in the form of Islam to the territory that Islam occupies today. And this most likely happened in Egypt. That is, the true Deuteronomy, dividing religion and morality into different vessels of human activity, appeared as a heresy within the First Law and its child, Islam, when it was still either Judeo-Christianity, or Nestorianism, or Orthodox faith, which must be distinguished from Orthodoxy. And all that remains to us from this long cataclysm is how Moses twice went to some mountain and brought different stone tablets from the god Yahweh. First – with the First Law, then – with Deuteronomy.

Then the life of Moses himself becomes more understandable. On the one hand, he is a recognized politician of slave-owning Egypt, on the other hand, he is an oppositionist, who was persecuted only after they came to their senses, after his "exodus" with a considerable group of like-minded people. Thus, Moses should be considered an even greater man than has been previously believed. It was he who, having divided religion and morality into different floors of human society, created the basis of Western democracy. Since the god Yahweh ceased to be interested in human relations within humanity itself, this humanity has submitted in this regard to the law, to jurisprudence.

Yahweh himself remained for the Jews of the Western tribe only a banner under which they identified and united. For those who do not understand this, we can recall a bunch of identifications taking place before your eyes. These include the riotous owners of striped shirts of different ages on Paratroopers' Day, and the dislike of cops and KGB agents, pilots and state security service officers, street kids and mama's boys, the rich and the poor, homosexuals and "normal" sexuals. This is precisely what "defending the honor of the uniform" is based on, even among those clans that have never worn uniforms. This is what identification is. And distinguishing features other than the god Yahweh can be anything, from shaved heads to pieces of iron on clothing. From a "lightning bolt" on the butt to an emblem on a cap. From "they're beating ours" to "Heil Hitler”. From "we are officials" to "take care of prosecutors" or "judges can do anything”. And please note that religion is not needed for anything other than identification among one's own kind. But I'd better focus on jurisprudence itself.

The entire Mediterranean was the area of Deuteronomy, but especially Constantinople. Even in the Pyrenees, Islam was defeated by Deuteronomy. And from Constantinople, Deuteronomy spread, not as a religion, but as jurisprudence, a part of Deuteronomy, its most significant part for the fate of mankind. Jurisprudence was necessary in communication between merchants, whether they worshiped Yahweh or

the mother goddess with a dozen names. Jurisprudence could not help but think of human rights. But according to traditional history, jurisprudence was born in Constantinople. Only historians cannot guess that it was based on Deuteronomy. And they write to us about different Justins and Justinians, supposedly, justice. It would be better to dig into the so-called "era of judges" in the Bible, which should undoubtedly be after Moses. In the East, Deuteronomy was never known, so cannibalistic rule appeared there. Cosimo Medici wanted to spread this cannibalistic rule to the West, and almost succeeded in this in the person of his descendants. But the jurisprudence that was born was already so strong that in the end the so-called Western democracy emerged. And the stronghold of cannibalistic rule gradually migrated to our beloved Motherland, under the protection of the atomic bomb, which robbed about 200 nations. And you and I began to say: "the law is like a drawbar, wherever it turned, there it went".

Two sides of the coin

Introduction

I claimed that initially, on the shores of the Arabian Sea in Yemen, the Jewish traders did not have 12 or 13 tribes, as they themselves claim in the Bible, but only two: eastern and western. The eastern tribe mastered India, moved to the Persian Gulf, settled there and split. Some of the Jews infiltrated the local elites of the aborigines, these are, according to my classification, the Israelites, mostly abandoned trade and created Islam and Judeo-Christianity (Nestorians). The second part moved further north as traders, leaving their former classical religion in service, these are the Judeans, and founded the Khazar Khaganate on the salt trade route. I will return to the Khazar Khaganate separately, and I will talk about the part that was infiltrated into the ruling elite here. Freed from the daily burdens of trade, the part of the Jews who had been introduced into the local elite devoted themselves to science and art, raising them to unprecedented heights in the East. But it was necessary to worry about an ideology, on the basis of which it would be possible to comfortably use the labor of the people and rule over them. It was necessary to create one religion that would meet the interests of the ruling elite of the natives and the Jews who had been introduced into it. This religion is Islam, the best religion for suppressing the individual aspirations of the people and directing them along a clear path: a step to the left or a step to the right from the main idea is an escape and execution, it is difficult for you in life, but after death - paradise.

The eastern tribe and the western one, about which I have not said a word yet, moved away in different directions, but did not lose touch (this is where the alphabetic writing invented by them came in handy), so they acted very synchronously. So synchronously that Islam reached Gibraltar. The main feature of this empire was that each section of this sausage had its own king or shah, which is why it later became fashionable to call the main king the shah of shahs, or shah-in-shah. But around each illiterate king there swarmed a bunch of advisers or viziers, who professed Judaism in their souls, but Islam outwardly. That is how it came about that a separate kingdom was ruled not by a shah, stuck in his harem forever, but by viziers. I even think that the viziers specifically invented harems for them so that they would not interfere with the governance. All the viziers of all these kings had connections and a common idea among themselves, thanks to which this "confederate" empire existed. True, not for very long.

This was prevented by local kings, the borders between whom were nevertheless established. Therefore, the original religion that was conceived began to double and triple depending on the tastes of the local kings and the Jews who served them with their heads. And, of course, everyone wrote their works. Naturally, only Jews knew how to write. The kings, having jumped out of the harem to drink and eat, gave

another idiotic order, sometimes they chopped off the head of some vizier from his shoulders, and went back there again. Therefore, the viziers' work was difficult. This is also indicated in fairy tales. This is where deviations from the general idea, fragmentation and variations with fioritures began to occur. All this is well described in the Bible during the construction of the Tower of Babel and the reasons for finishing its construction before completion. It must be said that the viziers, feeling the remoteness of other viziers, raised their status by not answering letters from neighbors. Gradually, connections almost ceased. But this happened after the schismatic letters on pebbles with Judeo-Christianity began to arrive in parallel with the Islamic orders. And everyone considered it their duty to show their own taste in which of them to take into account.

And at this point it should be said why historians consider Islam to be the younger brother of Christianity, 600 years younger. The fact is that Catholicism, having hatched from the nest of Judeo-Christianity, immediately added a thousand years to the chronology. This was very cleverly proven by Nosovsky and Fomenko, and perhaps Morozov himself - I don't know for sure. The fact is that even before the birth of Catholicism from the bank of Cosimo Medici, dates began to be written with the Latin letter "I" in front of the numbers, supposedly from the birth of Jesus. And then some smart guy counted this letter as one. It seems true, doesn't it? That's how Islam became 600 years younger. But if this unit, that is, a thousand years, is taken away when justice is restored, then Islam will become 400 years older. Which is what had to be proven, as mathematicians say.

The eastern Jewish tribe did not reach the Mediterranean, having bumped into the Caucasus, spreading across Iran, Central Asia and even the Southern Urals and Trans-Urals. And the western tribe, having sailed to Ethiopia, mainly concentrated in the lower reaches of the Nile, in Alexandria, where there were also salt deposits. And from there it spread along its southern coast to Gibraltar to the west, and to Constantinople to the east, which, naturally, did not exist then.

In Egypt, as well as on the shores of the Persian Gulf, a new religion reigned - Islam, slightly diluted with Judeo-Christianity. And those Jews who infiltrated the Egyptian elite became Egyptians, as in the east - Persians. Just as in the East the true Judeans who did not get into power formed the Khazar Khaganate, so in the West those who did not find themselves in the Egyptian elite founded Constantinople – the most profitable place in the world at that time. I have already proven in other works that Byzantium as an empire never existed. It was only the city of Byzantium – Tsargrad – Constantinople – Istanbul. With triple walls, from behind which a chain was stretched across the Bosphorus, wound around a winch. Not a single ship could sail without paying money. That is why sciences and arts began to flourish there, too, which do not arise otherwise than on a full stomach and from idleness. A job at that time was when you earn your living from morning till night, leaving a little time for reproduction. No spices, silks or other exotics could create a large cargo flow. It was predominantly salt, wood and slaves. There was no bypass, so they paid as much as they demanded. Triple walls protected from any military troubles. And I will never believe that some Oleg, "who nailed his shield to the gates of Tsargrad", could have overcome these walls if he did not have an accomplice inside the walls. These walls are impressive even today. I understand and believe in the "decay" of Byzantium. Roughly speaking, only a few men from the entire city worked on the gate with a chain across the Bosphorus. Beyond the walls stretched Asia Minor, which no one cared about, and the cities on both sides. But there were so many stories about Byzantium in all the ports of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea that they would be enough for more than one Bible.

On the way from Khazaria to Byzantium, port cities sprang up like mushrooms, in each of which Jews owned trade and finances, the rest was infrastructure. The dry path above the river was favoured by bandits who robbed merchants. There were also Jews among them, who sold stolen goods. So all these kingdoms-states today are half Jewish. Of course, there was communication between the Jews of the Khazar and Byzantine states. After all, both peoples were Judeans in my understanding of this term. But the Judeans made up an insignificant part of the population. All those peoples who live there today, lived there under the Khazar Khaganate, but each people was busy with its own business, briefly intersecting in common Khazar affairs, such as wars. As for the Byzantine Jews, they became Greeks. Probably because the island people, and there are as many islands there as sardines in a barrel, are connected with the sea, or rather with navigation. And all trade here is maritime. And the Jews, although connected with the sea, since they descended from the desert plateau to coastal Yemen, prefer to lead, rather than row and set sails. So the Jews became Greeks.

On this basis, I will analyze Renan's work about the Jews during their "Babylonian captivity", at the very last stage of this "captivity", which in reality never happened.

"Conversion" of the Goyim

Renan writes: "In relation to this era, there is no need to give the word "conversion" the dogmatic meaning that was put into it later. At that time, patron god was often changed, as soon as they found a more powerful one. The conversion of the "goyim" will be a consequence of the fall of Babylon. Those who escape the catastrophe will become apostles of Yagweh. (in Russian, Yahweh is better, that's how I usually write). They will go to all sides of the world ... The pagans, seeing the mercies with which Yagweh showers his people, will want to become worshipers of that God who is so useful to his worshipers".

This little phrase is not supported by anything in Renan, it is surrounded on both sides by poetry about a single god, which has nothing to do with history. It feels like he found it somewhere, conveyed it "in his own words" and wants to use it to justify the introduction of monotheism into the minds of non-Jews, which, they say, was introduced by the Jews themselves. Immediately, as soon as they were released from "captivity". Moreover, they introduced this god into "empty" heads, since he does not like the word "conversion".

Let us analyze whether this can really be, and if it can be, what it really was? First, about the "replacement of the patron god". Where did Renan see an easy change of god? At least one example. On the contrary, the change of god, "conversion" is a huge tragedy of the people, civil war, self-immolation, flight to inaccessible places. And this is not even a change of god, but only a cult to the same god, or rather, a partial change of the liturgy. Let him at least remember his St. Bartholomew's Day massacre. Why does he say this then? After all, it is not to fill the space of a book? I know what he needs, an easy transition to Christianity. It seems that this was done with sermons alone. Let him then remember how our Red Sun drove people into the Dnieper with sticks to be baptized. Or how Noblewoman Morozova was taken in chains. A Noblewoman, not a peasant. Peasant women were simply killed. That is, I want to say that the introduction of faith is a huge violence, be it monotheism or polytheism. Then they simply got used to it, like we did to the CPSU, the tragedy was forgotten over the centuries, and the less educated the people, the faster they adapted, the more of its members began to believe, as children believe, that they will never die. And any religion was introduced with great violence, and precisely because it was very profitable for the ruling class.

Secondly. How can you check for the "great power" of a god? This is complete nonsense. Was Perun less helpful to us than Christ? Where does this come from? Where are the statistics? I am writing this because I can't stand when they pull out of thin air and consider readers to be fools.

Thirdly, what kind of fool would throw away his god left and right, if he is so convenient and all-powerful? I have never heard that the Jews are so selfless. And in general, there are no people, except crazy ones, who throw away the most precious things, everyone likes to hide their wallet far away and part with it as rarely as possible.

Fourthly, how did the pagans see that Yagweh is overly merciful to the Jews? And they wanted the same. Nowadays people are more observant, however, I have not seen crowds standing at the synagogue to convert to Judaism. That is, all this is utter nonsense. Because Renan does not know how Christianity spread?

The phrase "the conversion of the “goyim” will be a consequence of the fall of Babylon" alone carries a lot of information. It would be good if Renan had explained why exactly "as a consequence of the fall of Babylon"? I even understand why he did not explain it. If the Jews had stayed in Babylon forever, Renan would have had to admit that Islam was born first, it would have been nearby. But then the Jews were returned to the shores of the Mediterranean, to their beloved Palestine, and there was the Roman Empire nearby - a wide expanse for Christianity. Renan did not yet know that this empire had never existed, especially in those days.

The word "goyim" remained pure, and it is very interesting. In Russian, this word is written "goy", that is, not a Judean, and therefore a despicable person, almost a fool, who does not know how to make his life profitable, rich, satisfying. But this word is eastern, from the eastern tribe of Judah, it is unknown in the West. And that says a lot. This word inhabits Persia, Khazaria and our homeland. I even wrote a special article about "гой еси добрый молодец" (what means “goy is a good fellow”). Already in the century before last, Russians had already forgotten what this saying meant. V. Dal writes that it is a greeting exclamation, like "Ах добрый молодец" (“Oh, good fellow”). I had to prove to him that it is just "good fellow - goy", that is, healthy to swing a club, but still - goy, a despised non-Judean, an aborigine.

It would have been better if Renan had not used it, if he really wanted to get to the Roman Empire with his Christianity. But how did he know that I, having latched on to this word, would spin its inconsistency. Since the Judeans were introducing religion to the goyim (goys), and they never introduced their native Judaism to anyone, they introduced Islam, since it is Islam that has won a final and irrevocable victory there to this day. Moreover, in those days Christ was not yet born to introduce Christianity. In this regard, I think that in some ancient books that Renan reread, something was vaguely mentioned about attracting the goyim to a good, correct religion. So he decided to use this fact for the benefit of Christianity, which he adored. And he got caught.

I also wanted to remind Renan that, in fact, the Persians had monotheism, headed by the god Mithra, a very nice young god, to whom even the Roman legions prayed, a "radiant youth" according to D. Frazer. Renan, of course, knew about him, but did not mention him, he interferes with his Jewish monotheism. Maybe that is why the Jews did not introduce a primary, new god, but rather “converted” from the old Mithra to the new Allah? And it was very difficult, as I said. But it was only the beginning, which lasted for two or three centuries. This is where the very effective Jewish method of mutual responsibility, “stoning”, was needed. Someone stole, they put him up against a pole and started throwing stones at him. Everyone

was in solidarity, no one liked thieves, and the people even encouraged him: it is your god Allah who punishes him with your hands. See how good he is. And the same awaits the adulteresses from your four wives. Do you feel the difference between your “radiant youth”, who is constantly trying to get under the skirt, and this serious guy?

“The Inhumanity of the Greeks”

Quote: “Greece, which created such beautiful things, art, science, philosophy, freedom, did not create humanitarianism”. It was too contemptuous of the barbarians for that. True, the Jew also despised the goyim; but the Jewish contempt did not have such disastrous consequences as the Greek. It did not prevent the emergence of Christianity, whereas the Greek contempt prevented Constantinople from assimilating the barbarians of the Slavic race, from conquering the Balkan Peninsula and the East completely, which would have allowed it to suppress Islam in the bud”.

I have written more than once that Renan likes to write some meaningful phrase, but not to decipher it in more detail, not to develop this thought. And immediately move on to a completely different subject. I realized that such phrases have a purely declarative role, because they are completely unprovable. Meanwhile, the postulate has settled in our heads and now we can rely on it. In general, this method is casuistry. The creation of false supports on which the building is built, of course, like on sand. And it seems to stand, but touch it with your finger, it will fall apart.

Let's look at this "sand", and then move on to what it is needed for. "Ancient" Greece and the Byzantine "empire", generally speaking, are inseparable. If you read traditional history, it turns out that the "Byzantines" lived only in Byzantium-Constantinople, and the rest of the space of the Black Sea coast and the eastern part of the Mediterranean were inhabited entirely by "Greeks". And the Greeks sailed, and the Byzantines sat idly behind triple walls and supposedly tribute flowed to them from all over the world from their dioceses. And this is complete nonsense, since to pay tribute it is first necessary to conquer the peoples from the Baltic to Constantinople, and then maintain fear in the conquered. And let historians now find me at least one campaign of the Byzantines for conquests and support of these conquests. They will not find it. Then there is nothing to talk about the Eastern Roman Empire. Moreover, beyond the walls of Byzantium in the direction of Asia Minor there is not a single decent city even today. Therefore, it is completely impossible to separate the Greeks from the Byzantines, especially since the true Greeks from the islands and the Peloponnese never called themselves Greeks, until the very construction of the city of Byzantium.

I will never tire of repeating that in those days, if you did not engage in trade and, especially, collect customs duties "for nothing" in the narrow hole of the Bosphorus, then 95 percent of social labor was spent on getting food. This is how people lived, who were not concentrated in Byzantium and in the port cities of the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. These were the "barbarians”. But in the cities, these same people, who lived as servants to the Jews, were no longer barbarians, but only Greeks. To this day, Jews will sit up to their ears in dirt, but they will not take a floor rag in their hands and will not wipe the dust. They will die of hunger, but will not dig up a garden bed. I am not even talking about Jews carrying bricks or laying walls. For these purposes - only hired labor. Or direct slaves. All the money and "cushy" positions, naturally, were occupied by Jews. And they despised the "barbarians" because they themselves came and organized this world customs all the way from Yemen, and the "barbarians", sitting on a potential pile of gold, did not even think of building Byzantium. Science and art, as well as sex, are attracted by good nutrition. This is evident

even from Soviet scientists who scattered around the world in search of good food. And those who advance science through hunger are not scientists. There are isolated exceptions, as in any other case, and they confirm the rule.

So how do the "Greeks" differ from the converted "goyim", the goys, discussed a little higher? And how do the Jews who create Islam in Persia differ from the Jews of Byzantium, who are only thinking about Christianity? Nothing. Well-fed Jews in Persia created the greatest examples of science and art. Well-fed Byzantine Jews created the same on the shores of the Bosphorus and its environs. Therefore, we must spit on the above phrase of Renan and forget about it, it leads nowhere, and is not a foundation.

Attempts to give birth to a single god from nothing

Immediately after the above quotation on “Greek inhumanism” and “Persian humanism”, Renan writes: “The only thing that offends our feelings in the book of Second Isaiah is the name of Yagweh. This name of a special national God has no place in such a universal book. It would therefore be consistent to abandon this strange word henceforth. A God with a proper name is a false god. He is a god among many other gods, and even when it is **possible to prove that he alone is God and that the others are not gods**, the fact still remains that there was competition, rivalry with others. But to abandon Yagweh wou**ld have been impossible at this time**. **It would have been tantamount to destroying the nation**. Yagweh has done so much for it! **That would have been philosophy; but philosophy has only in our time acquired** a direct influence on human affairs. The work of Israel, essentially rationalistic, consisted in identifying Yagweh with the Supreme God, with Adonai, with Shaddai, Elohim, in reducing Yagweh to Elohim, in pronouncing in a hidden form the aphorism: "Yagweh is Elohim", **thus returning, after centuries of groping, to the divine unity** which the ancient patriarchs, living in the desert, had grasped in long hours of idleness. (My emphasis). It seems, however, that from now on they will begin to be ashamed of the name Yagweh; they will soon replace it with the vague title "Adonai", "lord". They will avoid pronouncing it (which will be a way of giving it up), and **its vowels will be forgotten** in the course of time. Yagweh really disappeared after his victory. Hence the strange fact that the name of the God who conquered the world and became the only God is unknown to all non-Hebraists by profession, and that even the latter do not know how to pronounce it. <…> The monotheism of all mankind originates from the patron god of a tiny tribe”.

First of all, I will immediately note that it was not the Jews who assimilated the barbarians, but the barbarians who assimilated the Jews, otherwise neither the Greeks nor the Persians would have appeared. I mean the language. Although its development was determined by the Jews in the sense of expanding the vocabulary of the natives, the general structure of the language remained native. This is evident today in all countries without exception where Jews live. And their own Hebrew language of the state of Israel is today to a large extent an artificial language, collected from all the countries where they now live. So it is not a matter of "contempt".

Secondly, the phrase just quoted is a vivid example of the “logic” called sophism – a supposed proof, as if a proof seasoned with witchcraft like “pronounce an aphorism in a hidden form”, “its vowels will be forgotten”. Or this passage: the book is universal, and if it is universal, then Yahweh should not be in it. And if he is there, then he must be removed from the book. And Renan does not care that if he is removed, then there will be no book, because the book is precisely about him.

Thirdly, if Yahweh is “identified” with the gods listed by Renan, then this first of all proves that the Jews once had polytheism. But the fact that Yahweh should replace all other gods on earth is precisely what it does not prove.

Thus, Renan's incorrect understanding of the problem of why the Jews needed monotheism does not bring him closer to understanding why all other peoples were forced into the consciousness of one main god. I think that the Jews still have polytheism, at least the "Golden Calf" in addition to Yahweh. And the god of trade Mercury (I don't know what he is called), because mercury is silver, the main means of ancient payments. Only Yahweh is the main god because he is the god of unification of the peoples of the Jews, filling the pores in the substance. Without Yahweh, there would be no Jews, in the end. Therefore, the primacy of Yahweh in the pantheon of Jews is not at all necessary in all other peoples, literally rubbing against each other, pressed by the circumstances of life against each other and without Yahweh.

But those who think, God knows what, and all in different ways, people who make up the nation, are not needed by their rulers. They should be lined up and shouted: align! And they all look to the left. Then say: align to the right! And the same result. For me (insert the appropriate word) to the attack! And everyone runs where they are told, waving sticks, pikes, sabers and atomic bombs. This is what monotheism is for! And there is no need to carry any nonsense and gibberish to explain this phenomenon.

But this article is still called, as you remember, two sides of the coin. You know without me that Byzantium reached the last degree of luxury and debauchery. This is one side of the coin. Renan reports on the other side: “…many (Jews – mine) reconciled themselves to the exile and felt good in Babylonia. Thanks to their practical dexterity, they were able to find in the **city of luxury and pleasure** a thousand means to make their fortune. Insensitive to the religious memories of Zion, they did not feel the slightest temptation to leave the country, which would long retain all its significance, for a country which, due to its position between the sea and the desert, was condemned to remain poor forever”. If you did not understand, then this is Palestine. And if you agree with Renan, then why the hell do you believe that Palestine is the "promised land"?

But the main extract from Renan's quotation is that the Jews were happy both in Byzantium and Greece, and in Babylonia and Persia, that is, on both sides of the coin. And in order to remain there as long as possible, it was necessary to assimilate, joining the ruling elite, instill monotheism in the people, and throw out of their heads memories of the former "promised land", which they never had in this place. Monotheism on one side of the "coin" became Islam, and on the other side - Christianity.

I also consider it important that both religions composed it this way, remembering their own "First Law" that did not stand the test of time, mixing cabbage soup and flies into a heap, which completely confused these peoples. Moreover, they were very lazy when composing new religions, so they piled up so much nonsense in them that to this day no one can figure it out and "organize" it. At least the date of the celebration of Easter.

Islam in the Torah

"Persian domination" over the Jews began. And the Jewish Torah gradually began to resemble the Koran. Renan explains this by "the hardening of the Jewish cult", and I would ask him why the Jews needed this, if not to accept my version, which I never tire of repeating in each of my works. Renan himself does not

explain his “toughening” in any objective way, the Jewish priests simply needed it for some reason. Period. This is how he tells us about it.

“This entire comparatively new part of the Torah (from the time of the Persian rule – mine), although it is morally much lower than the Book of the Union, the Decalogue, Deuteronomy (here Renan replaces Deuteronomy with the First Law, with the moral part of the commandments, which are not in the real Deuteronomy), in a certain respect has more significance than the ancient parts”. In other words, Renan agrees that the “new part of the Torah” actually has no moral commandments. But according to my version, this is how it should be. And Renan continues: “It became that chain which Judaism could never break, which, on the contrary, it always tried to make heavier”. That is, Renan turns everything upside down. About 200 pages before this, Renan could not prove, despite all his efforts (see "The Judeo-Israeli Cocktail"), that Deuteronomy is the First Law. As a result, Deuteronomy began to have moral commandments, which in reality are not there. And here he faced the second problem, created by himself. It turns out that the Jews live according to the true Deuteronomy, without moral commandments. So, for no apparent reason, the "new part" of the Torah became "much lower in moral terms”. If this had happened during the time of Moses, everything would have been fine. But the "new part" for Renan arose only 450-500 years before the birth of Christ. That is, Renan actually admitted that the Jews live without moral commandments in the Torah until Christ himself, although 200 pages earlier he claimed the opposite. This is how he confirms it: “Only the first founders of Christianity will be able to get rid of it (from the “chain” – my reminder) and will accept a truly fruitful tradition…” And “the fanaticism of the Torah withstood the blows that should, it seemed, have killed it”, that is, the Torah remained unchanged, without morality.

I have written all this down many times, like clockwork. Here I have included all this Renanian nonsense, so that it is clear where I will move on. And then I will prove, using Renan's words, and not my own conclusions, how Islam is born in the depths of Judaism. I have said many times that Islam in everyday life and in liturgy is an exact copy of Judaism, which, firstly, speaks of its earlier origins compared to Christianity, and, secondly, that all freedom was removed from Judaism and replaced by strict regulations for the entire life of believers in Islam. Which, in turn, built the people into an army well organized by military regulations. Read:

"The cult became complicated in a strange way. Saturday was no longer a simple day of rest; It became a week-long holiday, which had its own special services. The **daily** sacrifice (tamid) was regulated. The custom of praying **three times a day** and praying **on one's knees** probably dates back to this time. Accepted by Muslims, this custom became the rhythm of Eastern life, to which the singing of the muezzin was to a certain extent adapted. Another rite accepted by Islam and which also acquired enormous significance was the habit of facing this sacred city during prayers, if those praying were outside the walls of Jerusalem. <…> This custom was especially respected by the Judeo-Christians, from whom Mohammed undoubtedly borrowed it. <…> He hesitated for a long time in choosing this point; and during his prophetic activity he chose Jerusalem, like the Judeo-Christians, his teachers. Then he bowed down finally before the Kaaba, and Mecca became the center to which the prayer of the Muslim world turns five times a day”.

I think Renan was right to mention Muslims and Judeo-Christians, because it is impossible to simply hush up this fact. It is better to present it in a way that is more advantageous to Renan. He needs to somehow record the earlier appearance of Judeo-Christians and send young Islam to them for training. And then refer to this completely unproven fact for the following constructions, considering this fact as if it were already proven. Let's look at these things without bias. Firstly, Islam is very close to Judaism not only in the above-

mentioned similarities in the liturgy. Islam and Judaism have absolutely the same attitude towards women and marriage, divorce, icon painting and sculpture of gods, the impossibility of drawing living nature, making do with only ornament. In general, the liturgy of Islam and Judaism are like two peas in a pod. The difference between them is only in the deacon's service, in human relations. Liturgy, as we know, is about serving God, and deaconry is about serving people on behalf of God. This is where the difference between Islam and Judaism is 180 degrees. A Judean outside of serving God is completely free in his relationships with people, because Yahweh is not interested in this at all. Do whatever you want: steal, rob, kill, disobey your parents, and so on. Yahweh doesn't care about this. If they kill you, rob you, or disobey you, these are also your problems, not Yahweh's. This gives a Jew an extremely wide range of options in his relationships with both Jews and everyone else. A Jew only needs help if he asks, and as selflessly as possible. But a goy - only for the highest interest, and if he doesn't return it with interest - slavery. I have already quoted all this from Renan. Muslims have the most primitive deaconism, no choice, everything is written down and defined in advance, just do it like a machine. This especially concerns the actions of Muslims in relation to their elite, mullahs and shahs, big and small. All this is so primitive that it could be done by tamed monkeys. This is precisely what shows that Islam is a religion of not very well-read aborigines, trained like in a circus.

Against the background of the above, two questions need to be answered: 1) which came first, Islam or Christianity? 2) how can both be implanted in people's minds? I'll start with the second question. One might think that uneducated natives go and spy on the Judeans and see that they live well. Renan thinks so, and has repeatedly stated this, including in the quotes I've provided. Having spied to the point of exhaustion, they learned the ritual, that is, the liturgy of Yahweh. They adopted it for themselves. At the same time, they spied on the deacon's service, but they didn't like it, so they invented their own. That's how Islam and Judeo-Christianity came about. And they started using them. But that's complete nonsense! I wish they'd snatched everything up, both the liturgy and the deaconry. But the fact that they did not steal the diaconate, which is very free among the Jews, but condemned themselves to extreme regulation, says that they had good teachers. Who knew in advance what to teach and how to teach. In order to command them later. Therefore, having written everything down in their synagogue in advance, they gave the natives a ready-made recipe for Islam. The first question is now even easier to solve. The minimal change in Judaism during the transformation into Islam, compared to the rather large changes in Judaism - into Christianity, just says, as machine designers say: from simple to complex. First a shovel, and only then - an excavator.

To Jerusalem as on a Birthday

Let's ask ourselves a stupid question: where do we go more often? At home or on Birthdays? So that you don't rack your brains, I will tell you: on average, you go to Birthdays ten times a year, and at home the remaining 355 days. The Jews also appeared in their Jerusalem as you do at a Birthdays. In this connection, Renan writes: “In some respects, the families that remained in Babylonia were apparently richer and more educated than the families that returned to Jerusalem. <…> In Babylon there were more fragments of ancient literature than in Jerusalem, and they were eagerly commented on. The soferim – scribes – were numerous. Next to the priest appears a scholar known under the name of mebin – “the one who explains (the law)”, this was like an official title. The title of sofer-magir, which is hinted at in an ancient poem, indicated a habit of writing, which the absolutely poor life of Jerusalem could not give. The length of time helped a lot in this. About a hundred years passed before Eastern Judaism ceased sending reinforcements to Jerusalem, often more significant than the party already established there”.

After this, can one really claim that the homeland of the Jews and Judaism belong to Jerusalem? Rather, it is a place of permanent assignment, like the one called a shift at Siberian wells, which is used mainly by oil and gas workers. They live God knows where, from Khabarovsk to Koenigsberg, but they all come together once every three weeks - to Tyumen.

Renan on the methods I have already written about

Remember, I wrote about the introduction of Jews into the native elite? This is how Renan writes about it: “High positions were available only to conquerors; but the administration had at its disposal a lot of places where the rayah, especially the Semitic scribe (sofer), well acquainted with the Aramaic scriptures, found a profitable use of his diligence. For example, a very pious Jew, the famous Nehemiah, son of Hakalia, made a career for himself around the middle of the 4th century. In 445 BC, he arrived from the East to Judea with the rank of footman of Jerusalem and with very large, according to him, powers from the court of Susa. For the strict zealots of the law, this was a great fortune, since Nehemiah, like all the Jews of the East, most strictly observed ritual and brought with him a ready-made plan of reforms in the most conservative spirit. This Nehemiah, perhaps a eunuch, made his small career among the court servants of the Achaemenid court during the reign of Artaxerxes Long-handed. According to a story which apparently came from himself, but which very clearly shows a desire to carry out the ideas of the Jews of that time, he was a cupbearer at court, and in the performance of his official duties he found an opportunity to serve the interests of his people. Service among the palace servants at the Achaemenid court was, as always at Eastern courts, the usual way of obtaining administrative positions. On the other hand, this way of using the service of a court lackey to obtain a high position is a special feature, so characteristic of Jewish stories of that time that it is difficult to take it seriously”.

Let us look at this quotation with the eyes of today. Jews are educated, persistent, do not give in to difficulties, genetically accustomed to overcome them in centuries of penetration into foreign peoples. They are good at calculating options and their consequences. And they found themselves in an environment where there is none of this, but only a leader, a king, a shah, to whom the people obey out of centuries-old habit, not even wanting to think, let alone learn. But the illiterate little kings are also not very good at thinking, instead of thinking, they are used to suppressing. And not respecting anyone, demanding by force that only they be respected, at least purely outwardly, ritually. And then there are traders, whom the little kings do not respect either, at least because they work hard in trade, paying money for everything else, including washing floors, and a sign of importance is to do nothing, receiving everything from their subjects for free. The traders immediately realized that for some trinket that the little king does not have and it is impossible to get it among his own, you can get a share of the little king's respect for the demonstrated dexterity and access to exotics, which are now commonly called exclusive. Of course, the little tsar won't do anything for a trinket from the vizier, his full deputy, but he will remember who exactly presented him with this trinket. Then everything will follow the scenario described by Renan, and he shouldn't say the last words regarding "a feature so characteristic that it is difficult to take it seriously”. And if he doesn't take his words back, then I will tell him: 80 percent of the Soviet property that became ownerless overnight went to previously unknown Jews. They managed to give the temporary owners of this property so many cheap, but exotic, candy wrappers that they got their way almost instantly. And quickly, from lackeys, in Renan's words, they became highly respected people. Now, to consolidate what they had achieved, they only had to replace religion, which is now ideology. As in those distant times, so in the present.

Samaritans are Israelites

If you remember, in the articles "Judeo-Israeli Cocktail" and "Renan Confirms My Concept of Jewish History" I indicated that the Judeans are those Jews who, on the basis of the true Deuteronomy, continue to trade without interfering in the politics of the nations they infiltrate. The Israelites are those Jews who, in parallel with their trade, begin to infiltrate the ruling elite of the people who have sheltered them, changing its political system, and most importantly - religion, since it is still too early to talk about the political system. The natives will not understand. That is why Renan's Israelites disappear to an unknown location, leaving no traces of themselves for Renan. Although I found these traces in Renan himself, he himself did not notice them, and if he did notice, he hid this fact from us.

The further the trading tribe approaches us from the depths of centuries, the more attention it pays not to trade itself (it remains only a way to penetrate the people at the very first stage), but to penetrate into power. This is evident in America. Of course, these words should not be taken too literally. Some Jews do not even think about penetrating the elite, they trade for their own pleasure. Knowing in advance that there is not enough room in the elite for everyone. Therefore, monolithic Judaism begins to stratify, pure Jews, they are pure traders, remain pure Jews. And those Jews who have penetrated the elite need to think about the future: how to remain in it forever. And Judaism is absolutely not suitable here. Judaism is a system of identifying Jews among the majority of non-Jews, but it has nothing to do with non-Jews. But one must penetrate into power among non-Jews who have their own religion. That is why Judaism is not suitable. It's like joining the CPSU - all roads are open to you if you shout at every corner, without thinking it seriously to yourself: "Glory to the CPSU!" But first, of course, you have to think of something to shout to interest the natives. The natives themselves will never guess about this. So they will pray to several dozen gods. And obey the Shah under duress.

But it is not for nothing that I say all the time that the Jews are widely educated and their heads are constantly at work, much more than their hands. Therefore, they immediately notice that it would be good to replace that Shah's stick of obedience with something more effective and invisible to the eye. Nowadays this is called "dominant ideology", and earlier - religion, since in the current ideology religion has come to occupy too small a part, because people in general have become much smarter.

In the previous part I looked at the actions of the Israelites in Babylon under the Persian rule, where they gradually turned into Muslims, and as Israelites they evaporated. I sent the true Judean traders to the north to organize the Khazar Khaganate. Together they are the Eastern Judah tribe from Yemen. The Western Judah tribe, having traveled through Ethiopia, Egypt and the southern Mediterranean, having reached the Bosphorus and built Byzantium there with the help of others, began to think: should they create the Roman Empire or not? They decided not to create it yet, maybe in the future, when Cosimo de Medici is born. Of course, they too should form both Israelites and Judeans (according to my classification). The Judeans, having been Judeans in Byzantium-Constantinople for a while, eventually transformed into "Greeks", and the Israelites partly joined the "Greeks", and partly went further - to form the city of Kyiv on the basis of timber trade. This whole bunch received the name of Samaritans, that is, "neither fish nor fowl". And a very small part remained Judeans, settling in Palestine and starving. That's how Renan found them there. The quotes are above.

It should also be noted that while the Jews traded and glorified Yahweh among themselves, they had no need to hide anything in their history. For this history showed how cleverly one could live comfortably, having behind them only Yahweh, the True Deuteronomy and the “era of the judges”. And historians, that is, those who knew how to write, were only Jews in those days. But when they moved from pure trade to

first underground, and then official, political activity, they became uncomfortable showing the whole world what they were doing to this gullible and illiterate world. And the history they wrote began to resemble the “History of the AUCP(b)”, written by the personal hand of comrade Stalin. The AUCP(b), if you have forgotten, is the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), since all the “Mensheviks” had previously been shot personally by the author. This remark of mine should always be remembered when reading Renan.

Now I will move on to the quotations from Renan “on the Samaritans” (p. 579 and further): “Samaria (ancient Shomeron) continued to be the center of these true, but poorly preserved remnants of ancient Israel (Renan’s concept of Israel is different, not corresponding to mine). The political and social position of these people, not destroyed by Assyria, was better than the position of the poor colonies of Judea. But the priestly organization of these lands, which were not touched by the activity of Jeremiah, was very weak. (On “the activity of Jeremiah” see above, “Islam in the Torah” and the article “The Judeo-Israeli Cocktail” – mine). They had only a vague idea of the Torah; the prophets were unknown to them; they apparently had no sacred scripture. Thanks to the friendly relations of the first people of Samaria with Eliashib and the priestly families, this gap was filled. The Torah, as it came out from its last edition, passed from Jerusalem to Samaria. Samaritan scribes copied it and introduced into it some minor variations. Their writing preserved a beautiful archaic character, while in Jerusalem they gave in to the whims of the cursive, which created a number of obscurities. Such is the origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch, several fairly ancient copies of which still exist. The Book of Joshua did not form part of the Torah borrowed by the Samaritans. Nevertheless, they apparently did not ignore such an important text. They received it as a book separate from the Torah, then made numerous additions to it concerning their history and their fabulous traditions”.

Now, if we, contrary to Renan, take into account that the Samaritans had nothing to do with the Persian vicissitudes of the Eastern tribe of Jews, being the Western tribe that founded Byzantium, also known as Jerusalem according to Nosovsky and Fomenko, then everything will fall into place. Firstly, the book of Navin, the successor of Moses, who died without reaching the end of the intended route to the Bosphorus, should be the fundamental document of the Western tribe’s colonization of the Bosphorus and the construction of Byzantium, and as such should be separate from the “new” Torah compiled in Persia. Secondly, for the same reason they should “have only a vague idea” of this very Torah of the “new edition”, compiled without their permission. And if we look from the “side of Persia”, then the Samaritans should have “poorly preserved the remains of ancient Israel”, which, according to my calculations, is located in Yemen. After all, they had not met for so many centuries, these two tribes, sailing in different directions. Thirdly, having founded Byzantium behind triple walls, the "Samaritans" (I will call them as Renan for now) could not be "destroyed by Assyria", and for the same reason they should have had a "better political and social position" as owners of such a favorable Byzantium due to the duties, compared to the Eastern tribe, which had just begun to arrange Islam for itself. In the struggle and hardships of the "transitional period". Although I have not forgotten that Renan never tires of repeating that the "Babylonian" Jews also lived very well. But, of course, worse than the owners of the world customs.

They also had no need to have prophets, since the prophets generally prophesied Islam with its harsh attitude towards the people and the confusion between law and religion. And here, in my opinion, Renan begins to lie shamelessly, without caring about decency. They say that the Torah passed to the Samaritans in a “new”, “Persian” edition. The Samaritan scribes, they say, “rewrote” it. What kind of fool would now “rewrite”, for example, the Constitution of Russia of the “fourth” edition in Old Slavonic Glagolitic or Cyrillic “of a beautiful archaic nature”, where there are about forty letters, if not more. And not a single one of

them would be read by even an excellent student of a modern ABC book. Why do I write so “impudently”? Yes, because “Jerusalem cursive with whims” is nothing more than Arabic script, which creates for Renan “a number of obscurities”. And because the "Samaritan Pentateuch" is "quite ancient copies that still exist”. That is, they existed before the "Persian-Babylonian Jews" switched from the same "not yet cursive" to "cursive with whims”. This means that the Eastern Jews, on their way to Islam, changed the ancient script of their writing, while the Samaritans remained with the old, ancient script.

And the most general conclusion from the quote is that these two "Israeli tribes" really did meet somewhere near the Bosphorus. And we should forget altogether that the Samaritans "then made numerous additions to it (the Torah - mine) concerning their history and their fabulous legends”. But we must not forget that these are not "fabulous legends”, but the most truthful legends, which for some reason Renan finds it more convenient to consider "fabulous”. Or maybe he likes Persian Jews more like a woman who is not liked by most other people. If it were a woman, I would even be glad: she has finally found her betrothed. But we are talking about history.

Here is another passage: "Thus (which is of no interest to me), the split between the Jews and the Samaritans finally took place”. So that's it, it turns out that in Renan the Jews and Samaritans are a mechanical mixture, like multi-colored balls. And I thought that the Samaritans and the Jews are one and the same, only some of them, for example, have absolute pitch, while others only distinguish words, including the completely deaf.

Here's something else interesting: "From several stories, one can conclude that Manasseh (another Judean king - mine) caused the migration of the Jerusalemites, dissatisfied with the strictness of Nehemiah (remember the "Persian slave, the cupbearer"?) regarding mixed marriages; for his part, Sanballat (Manasseh's father-in-law) attracted settlers, giving them land and money. This migration movement apparently continued in the following centuries. Violation of the Sabbath, consumption of forbidden meat, careless observance of religious prescriptions entailed severe punishments. In order to avoid them, they saved themselves and became Samaritans”.

I offer a choice, either the just quoted version of the resettlement to Samaria, or the fact that in Byzantium there was an earthly paradise behind triple walls due to trade duties for the passage of ships through the Bosphorus, that is, in fact, "manna from heaven”. To make it easier for you to choose, I will say that since ancient times Jews were not fools who tolerated brainless and cruel kings, like you. Or will you still choose mixed marriages, violation of the Sabbath and the prohibition of meat-eating as the reason? Then I will add that 80 percent of the Jews who left the USSR did not go to Israel, where everything is fine with the Sabbath, meat-eating and mixed marriages, but went to other countries, where life is also not bad, but there is no war with the Arabs. This means that they do not care about meat-eating, mixed marriages and the Sabbath.

I have already said that there have never been Jews in Jerusalem, they are either “relocated” or flee from there themselves. And this time Jerusalem was empty, the Jews fled from there themselves, until 1948, when they began to be brought there again and protected from the Arabs with American money. But for some reason Renan loves the Jerusalemites, and does not like the Samaritans: “… Samaritanism has always remained something rather mediocre, like a plagiarism of real Judaism. Nothing fruitful came out of it. Its greatest happiness was that Jesus loved it. Jesus always had a penchant for heretics, excommunicated, disgraced. Because of this, he sometimes liked to contrast these schismatics with the rigorists of Jerusalem”.

I will note that if Jesus loved the Samaritans only for his “penchant for heretics”, then he cannot be considered smart. I consider him more intelligent, therefore I would explain his love for the Samaritans not by such a trifle as Renan, but by unanimity, no less. For more details on this, see the group of articles "The Lost Link of History", as well as in my other works. It was Jesus who, for the peoples conquered without war, on the basis of faith-ideology, came up with the idea of returning to the FIrst Law, where liturgy and morality are mixed, and the normal human, competitive process of justice, based on law and separated from religion, is absent. Therefore, arbitrariness became possible. In the city of Byzantium, which historians still consider a vast empire, there was no law until Justinian himself. That is why Christ loved the Samaritans, who commanded there. At the time, when among the Judeans, living among themselves according to the true Deuteronomy, religion and justice were separated since Moses. Therefore, true Judeans only pretend that they do not love Christ. Christ made the peoples among whom they live obedient fools. How Christ and Mohammed divided the priority, I don’t know yet, but they both blew, as they say, into the same pipe. With variations.

From a sick head to a healthy one

The Russians say that you have to dance from the stove. This means that you have to start doing something from one start, that is, under equal conditions. Then the dancing competition will be correct. Our whole history dances from two stoves at once, located in opposite corners. There are never two stoves in a small Russian hut, that’s why they say: from the stove, a completely unambiguous place. When someone attributes the ravings of a fool to a smart person, they say: he shifts it from a sick head to a healthy one. And that smart person, hearing about this, exclaims: I was married off without me! These are the proverbs I will interpret in the specific conditions of the history of the Jewish people before the Birth of Christ, told to us by Renan.

Before writing history, you need to answer a number of questions: a) Is it possible for some people to reach great heights in culture, and then suddenly become complete fools, having forgotten everything? b) Was there a people at the beginning of history that was ahead of all other peoples in culture and led them, not giving primacy to anyone until today? Were there peoples of equal or higher development? Traditional historians answer all these three questions "yes", "no", "yes". That is why their history turned out so idiotic.

All my works show that I answer these three questions "no", "yes", "no", that is, three times the opposite. Actually, to the first question - not so categorically, and then - only initially, since it requires some explanation before a categorical "no". The Incas and Mayans had a high culture, and then they forgot everything and began to use their own teeth instead of mills. The USSR almost defeated or at least intimidated everyone, and now in terms of living standards it is almost in the very last place. It seems that to the first question one should say "yes", they are degrading. But I still say "no, they are not degrading", because they were like that from the beginning, and they had nowhere to degrade. This is especially clearly seen in the Incas and Mayans. To hew giant stones and lay out cyclopean walls from them - you don't need special intelligence and high culture. You only need a lot of obedient slaves, they will hew these blocks of stone with their teeth. And it is also necessary for a handful of owners of these slaves to figure out, out of idleness and a well-fed life, to hew and lay stones on top of each other. The high culture of the population as a whole, therefore, is not even close.

Let's take North Korea. The people were forced to eat only grass and everything they got was used to buy from developed nations everything that was sold to them, and all of this is owned by one person, just as

the king of the Incas and Mayans owned cyclopean piles of stones. What they don't sell to him, he steals, spending more money on stealing than on buying. Let's take the Soviet Union. The standard of living of the people as a whole remained at the level of the century before last. Everything they earned was used for two things: weapons and the personal life of the rulers. The smartest people were gathered in the KGB and institutes. The former steal innovations from abroad that their own scientists cannot invent. The latter, locked in secret towns like in a prison, invent bombs. Whatever they can't invent, the KGB will bring them. The rest of the people churn out for free what was invented and stolen. There is nowhere to degrade further, since there has been no cultural growth for 200 years. There is nothing to degrade from, they have not climbed to the heights of progress. Like the Incas and the Mayans. And if they tell me about space and rockets, I will answer that if our rulers were a little smarter, then 300 million people, half-starved and naked, could send two or three people to the Moon. Just look at the empty villages, huts, roofed with slate, roofing felt, iron, boards, and even oilcloth from the table, and a neatly attached trough. And all this mixed up. What kind of progress is there, from which regression should be counted?

Having answered myself three questions "no", "yes", "no", I thought about it and came to the conclusion: the Jews are both the source of progress and its engine in all other nations. And nowhere, combing the peoples like a comb, did they encounter a culture that would exceed their culture. That is, this is the only people, and there are no equals to it. (Details in my other works). None of the peoples have degraded, they only move at different speeds along the scale of progress. And the Jews are also partly to blame for this, I repeat, partly (Islam and Christianity). Since they did not touch Ancient China and Japan, Ancient India, and they did not progress very much, basically they built stone giants like the Incas or Mayans. Therefore, Ancient Babylon, Ancient Persia, Ancient Egypt, Ancient Greece, not to mention Ancient Rome - these are fairy tales for little children. If there were no Jews, there would be no them. It was the Jews who made them. They did not make only Ancient Jerusalem, they did not make any Jerusalem at all. It was made quite recently, and not by Jews, but by Christians, in order to go first to “conquer the Holy Sepulchre”, then simply to bow, and also to the UN.

It is on this basis that we read what Renan writes about “Jewish borrowings from Iran” (p. 581 and further). For example: “The genius of the Israeli people was asleep. In the era of its highest flowering in Babylonia, it was to a certain extent closed to any influence from outside; besides, the Chaldean religion was much lower than it, and Chaldean science was much higher. Now many customs and superstitions could penetrate. Of all the influences to which the Israeli people were subjected, the deepest was the influence of Persia. It continued even after the fall of the Persian kingdom. The Greek influence, which was so strong, did not prevent the Persian influence from making itself felt even in the 3rd and 2nd centuries”.

Let me comment. Firstly, genius never sleeps if it is applied to the people, and not to the individual. Secondly, how long can you teach the Jews if they still teach everyone themselves? Thirdly, in those distant times, science could not lag behind religion and vice versa, since science was an integral part of religion. And the simplest science, for example, how to make a wheel, a bucket and a knife - this is not science, but a craft passed down from mom and dad, like animals. The high science of those days, for example, astronomy, was certainly an integral part of religion. Fourthly, let's count the influences on the Jews in order: Egyptians, Egyptian Ethiopians, Canaanites, Philistines, Assyrians, Tyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans. I have missed a few, but there are still 10, and almost all of them conquered, brought them to themselves and taught them. And after almost every "influence-teaching" Renan is delighted - how "deep" it is! The Tyrians taught navigation, the Egyptians - to carry stone tablets in the ark. You see what nonsense turns out

when you dance not from the stove, but from whatever comes to hand. And why should all these peoples be married without them? It is much more logical to imagine the matter in the form of a comb, which, combing hair, collects fat from it, and becomes so overgrown that it itself needs to be cleaned. So it cleans itself on them. That is, the comb both collects and gives. And without any wars and captivity, from only one desire to live better, trading and collecting profits. I am already tired of talking about this.

And finally, how did Renan simultaneously have both Greece and Persia "to influence"? Did they exchange Jews?

Digression for the Führer and the Toastmaster

A significant phrase from Renan, who did not yet know about the real German Führer of Austrian blood: "The symbols of Iran are majestic and striking. Feruer, a kind of apotheosis, an ideal image of protest against reality, was, like the disk of Aguramazda, in secret harmony with Yagweh. If Yagweh had ever been given a correct image, then he could only have been presented in this form. The coin on which one satrap of the Jewish or Samaritan lands ordered an image to be struck, which, apparently, was an image of Yagweh, undoubtedly dates from this time, and Persian influence is clearly felt on it. The cult itself suffered from the prevailing tastes. The altar of tamida or permanent sacrifice in the second temple is extremely similar to the pyree, and the legend wanted to see in this unquenchable fire a semblance of eternal fire, a brother to the burning oil springs in Baku".

Transcaucasia could not have captured the Jews. There are too many peoples there to agree on this. And without "captivity" the Jews could not have gotten there, according to Renan, they have nothing to do there, according to Renan. They have enough of their own shepherds. I mean real shepherds, not pastors. According to Renan, they came to Babylon with their flocks, to pasture them in the grain fields, even before the "Babylonian captivity". Where did all the peoples of the Caucasus adopt the Jewish word tamada (tamida)? After all, it simply means an altar on which meat is placed for the god Yahweh. And wine, of course. So the tamada - the master of the table at a Caucasian party - came straight from the Jews. If you want to know how it happened, read my article "Linguistics".

Adolf Hitler loved the Aryans, especially those with the "Nordic" character, that is, the northern character of the Vikings, highway robbers who spare neither strangers nor their own, just to kill. But Renan found the first and main Aryans in Afghanistan, who are not heard of as robbers. From Afghanistan to Iran - a stone's throw, neighbors. And, probably, also Aryans. The Fuhrer (feruer) for Iranians is "a symbol, majestic and amazing, an ideal protest against reality". That's one. But he is also "in secret harmony with Yagweh", "apparently, an image of Yagweh", that's two. But Yahweh cannot exist without Jews, he is the Jewish god after all. Therefore, Fuhrer is more of a Jewish word than a Persian one. From the eastern tribe, from the times when the Jews established a high culture there and had already taken up Islam.

Hitler probably did not read Renan and did not know that the Fuhrer is, by and large, Yahweh, the Jewish god, but that he took this word as his name for the "apotheosis" of the Earth is certain. He did not invent it himself. It is also certain to me that Fuhrer Hitler understood the history of the Jews in the same way as I do, that is, as the fundamental nation in the world, which made the world what it is in 1935. And not as an eternally "persecuted" nation, as historians led by Renan understand the Jews. And he saw them as his competitors, it was not they who were to rule the world from now on, but he himself. And he began to exterminate them completely, and the Jews were very surprised: why is this? They were very surprised, because he took them by surprise. At first, they even helped him seize power, they did not suspect his

treachery. And then it was too late. And it took them a long time to implement a slogan like Marx, who was also a Jew, by the way: Jews of the world, unite!

Hitler made a very correct calculation, in terms of military power and German ideology. And he would have ruled the world if he had not started to destroy the Jews. But two bears cannot live in the same den, as the Russians have noted. So if Hitler had not started to destroy the Jews, they would have eventually penetrated his world domination, first as servants, then as cupbearers, as Renan writes, and then as viziers, as I inform you. So Hitler would have sat on the world throne as an "image" on a "coin", which "one satrap of the Jewish or Samaritan lands ordered to be struck", as Renan put it.

I am writing this because it is impossible to destroy the "quiet" power of the Jews, no matter how many brainless "fuhrers" are born again, and they are born every day. I inform these fools: you need a thousand years to “study, study and study”, as Krupskaya put it. But even that is not enough. You need a thousand years of training in quietly penetrating peoples, and not only in mechanical and painless penetration, but also penetration into the consciousness of peoples through language, writing, science and art. And no community of people is capable of this. First, you need to invent an identification god Yahweh, who would act at a distance, uniting the apologists of this community. Is all this within the power of one person at the current stage of our history, who would not only write Mein Kampf, but also implant it in the heads of at least a third of humanity? After all, this would take a thousand years, and no one has or will have this thousand years. The fate of the quick-tempered people is to douse themselves with gasoline and burn in a bright flame.

But there is a way out of this impasse, as from any impasse - only one - to catch up with the Jews. In determination, in education, in overcoming difficulties and, of course, in unity. To catch up constantly, in dreams and in reality, from early childhood to old age, without getting tired. You can complain about your unhappy fate, even Jews do this all the time. But to stop halfway and rest, God forbid! Fuhrers! Have you heard? In a thousand years you too will become Jews, or rather your great-great-great-grandchildren, not earlier. Are you capable of this? Then act right from today. There is no other way anyway. I have already mentioned the quick-tempered people, so forget about “the pike’s command and my desire”, the Chinese “great races” and other nonsense. By the way, the Jews also invented this fairy tale for you and diligently implemented it. Better repeat your own proverb more often: “no pain, no gain”. There will be no "good king" or "pike's command". That's what my approach to history tells me. And it's so simple.

As for Renan, it was not for nothing that he was republished in Russia a hundred years later. And it is not for nothing that I criticize him.

Do not think that the Jews are originally from Persia.

They are there in practice, in passing

Renan: “In essence, Persian customs were much closer to the customs of the Jews than later the customs of Greece, Rome, and the West. All the personalities who have to play a role in pious novels, Nehemiah, Zerubbabel, Daniel and, in a certain sense, Ezra, began their careers as court servants. The ideal of the Jewish novel were those customs that were later reproduced by the Baghdad Caliphate; cheerful, calm, bourgeois customs, under the rule of a simple-minded despotism, sometimes stupid and paternal, sometimes cruel and laughing. Life under the scepter of the Achaemenids in the East was, apparently, pleasant”.

What is this historian talking about? This is complete nonsense, if you think about it for a moment. According to Renan, the Achaemenids conquered Babylonia together with the Jews who had been captured there by that time. What kind of "scepter" did they live under then? The scepter is not the property of captives, but of the masters of the land. Well, to hell with it, with this scepter. To be a serf, a "court servant", is that a "pleasant" life? And what is "simple-minded despotism"? Is it when they give you scraps from the table and then "simple-mindedly" punch you in the face for taking them with dirty hands, or what? I agree, despotism is "stupid" and "cruel", otherwise it would not be despotism. But can you imagine "laughing despotism", "paternal despotism"?

Renan has facts. He does not know where to put them, or how to explain them. And he talks nonsense. From my point of view, these facts are easily explained. The traders came to trade. To do this, they need to please the despots who rule there. They give them strange gifts, get into service, the expansion of service, they are invited to the threshold, they get to the bedroom, they begin to be reckoned with, and they - unobtrusively suggest: how to live on. This is how it looks in Renan himself: "In the era when the legend of Moses received its final touches among the Jews, a **completely parallel cycle of religious myths** was being compiled in Persia. These similarities, as well as many others, must gradually have established a closer connection between the Jews and the Iranians. It is certain that long-term relations entailed some mutual borrowings ..".

Let's think about it. There is nothing "completely parallel" in nature at all, even parallel lines, according to Lobachevsky, intersect. It is not for nothing that I have given answers to three simple questions above, which fundamentally differ from Renan's, and from "historical" questions in general. The Iranians could not have been more developed, since, unlike the Jews, they had not yet communicated with anyone. The Iranians did not even have alphabetic writing, since it is impossible to make such a discovery parallel to the Jews. I have proven this in my other works. And why do they need writing if they do not know trade, since to trade you need to be constantly on the move, and before the Jews they sat idly like Ilya Muromets on the stove. Therefore, it is one hundred percent that the Jews brought them their "final touches of Moses". They remade them into Islam. They themselves climbed into power, to Islam. They introduced sciences and arts, at the same time averaged out their language and writing ("cursive"), and then said: Mr. Muromets of Aryan blood, stop sitting on the stove, you are already 33, let's go to war. The Persian Muromets went to war, and the Jews stayed to count their money. True, by this time they were no longer Jews, but Persians. The Jews who did not come to power went to trade further north, and to organize the Khazar Khaganate there. The "Greeks", of course, did not know anything about this yet. They were not from this, the Eastern tribe of Israel, but from the Western.

I wrote it all down like clockwork. But there were difficulties along the way, which the Jews always persistently overcame. The main difficulty was the struggle for power, already within the elite. The fat, sedentary local elite, holed up in their harems, built especially for them by the Jews, enjoyed it. But there were also those, like the bearded Russian boyars in fur coats, with sleeves to the floor, under the first Peter, who did not like Peter's flirting with foreigners, their introduction into high society.

And this is exactly what Renan writes about, without even suspecting it: "Many features of Jewish life come from Persia. The Jews were especially lucky with one holiday, highly revered in all Persian lands; this holiday even gave rise to a legend, which is a **repulsive stain** in all their sacred literature (emphasis always mine). At the end of the year, the Persians had a holiday, accompanied by feasts with gifts that were exchanged mutually. This holiday was called Furdi. The Jews adopted it as a heathen festival, and celebrated

it, like the Persians, in the twelfth month; they called it in Aramaic Purdai, in Hebrew Furdim, whence, by an easily explicable paleographical error, came Furim or Purim. **This festival was not celebrated in the temple; originally it was not a religious solemnity**. However, it was desired that it should have its own Haggadah, and for this purpose the books of Esther were compiled. Every festival among the Jews is based on a historical legend, and a special book or scroll, the megilla, was devoted to it. **It was supposed** that Purim was connected with the great triumph of the Israelite people and the execution of their greatest enemy. **But since the festival was not religious, they systematically refrained from using the name of God in the story and did not introduce any religious reflection into it. Thus was born one of the strangest of books, an evil, impious, rebellious book, which, in spite of its contents, became a religious book. The people of Israel are presented here as a terrible people, who kill their enemies with their inner strength, and whose neighborhood is to be feared. Meanness, love of dirty tricks, lack of moral sense, hatred for the rest of the human race are carried here to the highest limit. This is the ideal of an evil time, with all good qualities omitted. What terrible characters of Esther and Mordechai! What cunning! What lack of self-respect! What cruelty! For this shrew the death of her enemies is not enough, she also needs to put corpses on display, corpses of children! And the author, describing all this, feels only a feeling of satisfaction**. Artaxerxes, who allowed the Persians to destroy the Jews, allows the Jews to slaughter seventy-five thousand of their subjects. Actually, the latter allow themselves to be killed by a handful of people, and thus this shows that **all these sad stories take place in the realm of fantasy**. The best apology for this **unpleasant book** may be that it tells **of things that never happened**".

Renan almost went mad with amazement. And therefore he does not notice at all the nonsense that he is talking about the essence of the issue, having used all his ardor to describe the atrocities and his amazement. And there is absolutely nothing to be surprised about here. If, of course, we take my point of view, stated in the paragraph above. I have already spoken about the introduction of foreigners into Russia under Peter. And Peter also executed opponents of the new course from among the old boyars. And no one is surprised by this. And all these stories are also not included in the holy scriptures of the Russian Orthodox Church. And a day like "Purim" is not listed in its calendar. And the fact that the aforementioned foreigners did not write their “Book of Esther” means that they did not have Judaism to “unite” them stronger than a rope. And our “ancient” boyars themselves, like “Sheremetev the noble” by Pushkin’s nickname, were not Russian at all. Let’s look into Dahl’s Dictionary: “Shert” is the oath of allegiance of Muslims. To give shert. Shertnye gramata. To shert (Шертовать) is to swear allegiance. Shert entry (Шертоприводная запись) is a sworn sheet for Muslims”. There are no more Russian words with the root “sher”, except for sharomizhnik (sheromyzhnik), but this comes from the French Cher ami – dear friend. Therefore, sheremet is the one who presented (threw) the oath of allegiance, and sheremetev “the noble” is his son or follower, answering the question “whose will you be”, like all Russians: Ivanov, Petrov, Sidorov.

Let me return to the Jews, however. The holiday of Purim could have occurred not only in the struggle for power between the new "foreign" and the old "own" elite. Then it would not have been retained by the true Judeans, who did not climb into the ruling elite, but continued to trade, infiltrating another nation. Therefore, it could have been a struggle of true Judeans with Judeans converted to Islam. True Jews took revenge by this method, so colorfully described by Renan, on their brothers who betrayed their faith for the paradise life of the Shah. And they remembered this forever, so that others would not dare to follow the bad example. This did not apply to Yahweh, because according to the true Deuteronomy, he was not interested in the affairs that took place between people. But the Jews were sorry to part with such a vivid

example of the punishment of betrayal, and gradually Purim became a religious holiday. Moreover, Renan continues: “The Book of Esther, in our opinion, belongs to the end of the Achaemenid era, to the time to which also belongs the fragment inserted in the Book of Ezra, very similar to the Book of Esther and forming part of the fabulous history of the restoration of Zarubabel, full of apocryphal office insertions and striking in the extreme confusion of the chronology of the Persian kings. In these works of low quality, a high idea of the Achaemenid dynasty constantly breaks through, since the Jewish author was very happy and proud that the cruelty of the Achaemenids was directed for the benefit of his co-religionists. These executions fill him with joy and he does not miss the opportunity to report that the Persian king ordered many people to be hanged for the greatest good of Israel”.

It should be added that it was not for nothing that Renan started talking about the “mixing up of the chronology of the Persian kings” in addition to the offensive words: fabulous, low-class, bureaucratic. He needed “the book of Esther to belong to the end of the Achaemenid era, to the time to which also belongs the passage inserted into the book of Ezra, which is very similar to the book of Esther”. But the chronology does not work. So he pounced on the insults. And why did he need this, you ask? And then, so that this would be an isolated case that shocked him so much, whereas this was a certain rule of the “Fuhrer’s struggle”.

Renan absolutely needed someone to teach the Jews wisdom and reason. Why he needed this, I do not know. So, he needed the Jews to borrow the Jewish angels that existed before the Achaemenids from the Achaemenids. "Ancient Jewish angelology was extremely simple”. But "the amshaspands, izedas, and feruers were the parts of the Persian cult that most astonished the Jews”. In short, the Jews stole them for themselves. And Renan has no idea that the Jews study all their lives and constantly work with their heads, and this is their main feature, which allowed them to take over the world without any wars. And historians cannot write history without wars. Maybe that is why Renan forgets that when the Jews left Yemen, they were just children, and studied in the first grade. They got to Persia already as tenth-graders. So their angels matured by 10 figurative years, each year of which is equal to a century. Therefore, it was not the Persians who taught them, but they taught the Persians. It is so simple.

And again some nonsense. Renan praised and praised the Persians for their kind attitude towards the Jews, I even found it a little funny. Why do they treat slaves like that? After the Persians, no one has demonstrated this to historians. And suddenly, out of the blue: “The literary decline (p. 586) went hand in hand with political and moral degeneration. It seemed that the genius of Israel had died out. The ancient Hebrew language was falling into oblivion every day and was being replaced in popular usage by Aramaic, which became the spoken language of the East. It was the usual language of the Achaemenid chancery. Everywhere, except in the Phoenician cities and colonies, it sought to displace the ancient Semitic language, which stood so much higher in its strength and literary beauty. <…> The ancient Hebrew orthography, devoid of vowels, gave rise to a mass of ambiguities; then they began to put silent letters-signs to make reading easier; but they were placed haphazardly. The copyists, not understanding well what they were copying, and at the same time not wanting to write obvious nonsense, made countless mistakes”.

Of course, a poor student can be forced to copy "War and Peace", and he will make a lot of mistakes there. It will be funny to read, but still, to the last word, it will be clear. Or am I wrong? I know that I am right. And the fact that the Jews switched from Hebrew to Aramaic is also understandable. Where, for example, in Russia have you seen Jews speaking Hebrew? They even speak Russian in Israel. But at some point they did begin to learn Russian. Especially since at that time the Russians did not know how to write at

all, just like the Persians. And that is why the Jews invented “vowelless letters-signs” for the Aramaic language, which has vowels, unlike the Hebrew language, but has no writing. Only temporarily, until the real reform. They had to get out of the situation somehow. And why make a tragedy out of it, babbling about a “literary fall”? It’s so simple. Why “cast a shadow over the fence”? Oh, that’s why. Renan doesn’t like “one Levite, (in all likelihood a singer of the Jerusalem temple)”, who decided to write something there contrary to Renan’s opinion. “The spirit (of this) author of Chronicles is extremely narrow, his mental process is sad. Never has a frivolous and inattentive attitude to sources gone so far. No writer has spread so many errors throughout the world as this miserable compiler. He had a poor understanding of what was written, and besides, the texts he had in his hands were very faulty. It is difficult to imagine a more pitiful philologist, a more sad critic and a more inexperienced paleographer”. From this nonsense of Renan's you must undoubtedly understand that Renan sat next to "this pitiful compiler" when he, more than two thousand years ago, showed Renan his "extremely narrow spirit" and his "sad mental process”. For Renan does not even really say what he is criticizing. In general, the Bible, which, "starting from the year 400, consists of two complete parts, to each of which even mentally it is impossible to allow any addition - these are the Torah and the Nebiim (prophets)”. And only for this, in general, completely insignificant fact, Renan not only swears with almost Russian obscenities (after all, he is a St. Petersburg academician), but also in anger gives me the upper hand. This upper hand is the story of how the Hebrew language was transformed into Aramaic. But you've already read about that.

Jesus

1. Judas

From the previous section, you have probably noticed that the Jewish trading tribes made Judaism exclusively for themselves, especially Deuteronomy, which is still valid today. I repeat, do not confuse it with the "First Law", which Christians "stupidly" profess. Therefore, the birth of Jesus Christ, although it really happened, was of no use to them. Attentive people will immediately ask me a completely legitimate question: how so? The Judeans have an identification among themselves based on the worship of the god Yahweh, and Jesus is their kin. Kin is kin, of course, but he raised a rebellion in the full sense of the word in his monolithic collective, I will answer. Moreover, he wanted to overthrow the foundations of foundations, Deuteronomy, and again go to the "First Law", in which the god Yahweh, of course, was revered, but not exclusively, but in parallel with love for one's neighbor, "do not steal", supposedly, "honor your parents", "do not commit fornication" and so on. But this was already a past stage, which showed its unacceptability for the disunited life of Jews among alien peoples, at the expense of whose labor, the "Amkhaars", the "down-to-earth", Moses bequeathed to the Jews to live happily.

Jesus was not a fool, especially since Postnikov writes about him as "a highly educated scientist, a member of the corresponding secret orders and (judging by the gospel stories) knew magic, alchemy and knew how to treat nervous patients. It is unlikely that he could have achieved all this without being of rich and noble origin”. Therefore, he understood perfectly well why Moses broke the first tablets with the "First Law" and "brought from God Yahweh" the second, with Deuteronomy. He understood, but at the same time he wanted to make a revolution doomed to failure among his own people. It is impossible to understand such an idea in its pure form. Therefore, the "scholars" decided that Christ wanted to do "good" to all people on Earth, and badly to his relatives, the Jews. But then Jesus is a half-wit. I will leave consideration of this question for later, but for now I will ask: how would you personally act if your relative began to

distribute your joint inheritance right and left, leaving you "without means of subsistence"? And how would you treat a person who would stop in any way, I emphasize, in any way, the actions of a half-wit - a relative?

Postnikov has the answer (Vol. 2): "The Legend of Judas (Genesis, XXXVIII). This is a rather indecent story about how the daughter-in-law of the patriarch Judah, Tamar, pretended to be a prostitute, lured Judah and gave birth to twins. It is interesting that modern Jews-Judaists originate from these twins. In particular, the genealogy of Jesus Christ is derived from the frivolous adventure of Judah with the widow of his own children. Despite everything, the biblical womanizer is valued in the Bible unusually highly and is compared to a young lion (Genesis, II, 9). It is noteworthy that the name of the Gospel Judas Iscariot also means "A man like a lion" (AYSH-K-ARIE). The two Gospel Judases, Judas the brother of Jesus and Judas the traitor, are a split in the same personality. Now Judas of Jacob is added to them. But how could this same Judas the traitor become, even symbolically, one of the forefathers of the Gospel Christ himself, and in such an unworthy way even from the point of view of ancient man: by promising a kid of goat for this to the widow of his own masturbator son, whom he took for a prostitute? According to the Talmud, the mother of Jesus is also portrayed as a roadside woman".

Postnikov can keep the "indecency of history" to himself, he simply does not know that in those days incest was not considered some kind of out-of-the-ordinary circumstance. It was even less embarrassing than blowing your nose today with two fingers in the foyer of a theater. Don't pay attention to the confusion in these extramarital affairs and so many Judases, these are many stories about the same thing gathered together, and each of the storytellers forgot something and got it wrong. Pay attention to the fact that this "sexual lion" was a "patriarch", that is, in fact, a successor in some tribe of Aaron - the patriarch of Moses himself, a very high "position". In other words, Jesus was from the highest Jewish society. And Postnikov did not have to provide "indirect" evidence of Christ's nobility.

Secondly, pay attention to the real "indecency", which I will now talk about. The more or less "decent" biblical expression "mother is roadside woman" in Russian means nothing more than "fuck your mother". This "polylingualism" is found in almost all other languages, of course, "Indo-European" (I checked), and is the most terrible insult, which the apostate Christ deserves in the eyes of the Judeans. And Judas is the most worthy person, a "lion" in all respects. Only they did not know then the "stable phrase" "in all respects" and used the most "killer" for them: "man-lion" in comparison with "masturbator" sounded especially "proud". And look how they whitewash the daughter-in-law's lover? "I didn't recognize her, you see. She "pretended to be a prostitute" so that, seeing her forty times a day, "he didn't recognize her".

I want to say that the Bible, written, as is known, by the Jews, treats the renegade and traitor, Jesus, and the accuser, or rather, the "spy" who was planted in the enemy's camp, Judas, quite adequately.

2. The personality of Christ "not for publication"

Postnikov (Vol. 2) quotes I. T. Sunderland: "It can be said without exaggeration that not a single scripture of the Bible, not even the psalms, full of curses, or the books of Joshua and Judges with their stories of various cruelties, contain so much that is alien to the teaching of Jesus as some things found in this strange book (the Apocalypse). The image of Christ reproduced in it, merciless, destructive, vengeful, much more closely corresponds to the image of Nero or Satan". "This terrible figure of the "son of man" appearing in the clouds, who tells us: "I am the alpha and the omega" as Yahweh in Isaiah says to himself: "I am the first and I am the last". But there are also such words, I will add: "I am the alpha and the omega, the first and the last", that is, it contradicts what has just been said, increases its "price".

"What relation do all these different figures have to the "simple" Jesus of the Gospels?" A. Drews asks himself. "The discrepancy between the "apocalyptic" Christ and the "evangelical" has caused and continues to cause heated debates among orthodox theologians and historians. These disputes, without leading to any solution, have only revealed all the contradictions of the orthodox-traditional point of view on Christ".

"At the same time, historians have no answer to the question of who, if not the Apostle John, was the author of the Apocalypse. Kublanov M.M.: "... the question of who wrote the Apocalypse cannot be considered resolved at the present time". "There are two large schools united only by the desire to separate the Apocalypse as much as possible from the other books of the New Testament. Harnack and Fischer believe that the Apocalypse was written after all the books of the New Testament. "... the majority of scholars of the Tübingen school are inclined to believe that the Apocalypse is the earliest work of the New Testament". "Luther did not recognize it as either apostolic or prophetic and declared that he saw no reason to believe in its origin from the Holy Spirit". "Zwingli also did not consider it a biblical writing, that is, he did not include it among the canonical".

"Historians apparently do not even have a hypothesis about the reasons why the Apocalypse was included in the canon". According to Postnikov, the Apocalypse was written by John Chrysostom, a brilliant mathematician and astronomer-astrologist, who wrote it in Antioch (Syria). "... and all the priests of Constantinople, and the surrounding bishops, and all the people ... unanimously demand that in place of the high priest, "in addition to all the self-interested applicants", they seat none other than the disgraced, never officially recognized, oppositional presbyter John, who had never been in Constantinople before". In general, according to Postnikov, this is Jesus Christ, who, at the "demand of the people", was forced to be seated by the emperor on the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, and then, according to all the rules of jurisprudence, was condemned by the court and sent into distant exile, on the way to which he died.

So, what are the questions posed? Here they are in concentrated form:

• was the Apocalypse written before or after the Gospels? The answers are directly opposite;

- why is the "apocalyptic" Christ opposed to the "evangelical" Christ "out of love"? There is no answer;

- who wrote the Apocalypse? Anyone from the Apostle John to Christ himself. Among them there may be someone who has nothing to do with the Bible at all;

• why was the Apocalypse included in the Christian canon? "There is not even a hypothesis".

As you can see, there is no clear answer to any of the questions. Therefore, perhaps the answer to the question of whether Christ was a "half-wit" that I posed above will allow us to get closer to solving the previous questions?

So, Christ, being an extraordinary member of the ruling elite of the Judeans, decided to take away the privileges of his fellow citizens in order to give them to all nations, to all mankind. By this he earned the hatred of his fellow citizens. But all other nations, all mankind, so to speak, did not yet know about their capabilities. They had to be preached. And Christ, as an intelligent man who knew the history of the development of his people from the "First Law" to Deuteronomy, should have propagated Deuteronomy among everyone and everything, so that it would be the property not only of the Jews, but of the whole world. "Take away the privileges of his people" here should be understood, naturally, figuratively: the spread of the "privilege of knowing Deuteronomy" to everyone would thereby equalize the Jews and

everyone else. The rules of life for the Jews would remain, of course, but everyone would become "Jews", and not just the Jews.

And exactly 2000 years ago, a modern Western-type society would have arrived, introduced by the efforts of Protestants, mainly Calvinists. People would have stopped relying on God, asking Him for this and that, and would have relied only on their own strength and ingenuity. And they would have the same as the Judeans according to Deuteronomy: be one family, but do what is personally beneficial to you and do not fear God in your deeds, but answer for your deeds only before the Law. You need God only to be united, to determine yourself, to identify yourself in love for him.

But that is the whole point, that modern Western society is built exactly contrary to what Christ postulated. And it took 2000 years for that. He postulated completely different rules for society: to rely on God and He will decide everything for them all and each, no independent action, no manifestation of personality as such, "a step to the left - a step to the right is considered an escape, I shoot without warning". Calvinists had to remove all professional priests from work and choose them from the most successful citizens, so that they would teach the new by their own example and uproot the old, hardened over 1500 years.

In addition, Christ knew very well that the verbal husk of "moral commandments", which is muttered day and night from the pulpit, flies off like an onion as soon as the people leave the church. But the Law, not God's, but human, and the Inevitability of Punishment work much more successfully. Otherwise, Moses, whom he may have even seen when he was just a boy, would not have rewritten his famous tablets.

But Christ, knowing full well about the worthlessness of these commandments, used them first and foremost, put them at the forefront of his propaganda, which was extremely intense, pushy, as if he had read Marx. But he, as an intelligent person, understood perfectly well that all this would please the common people very much. Look, Lenin caught the entire Russian people on this very thing. But it was the Russian people, exhausted in slavery, and not the Western people, who already understood some things. So Christ did not go to the Jews with his propaganda, but to the illiterate aborigines, through whom the Jews were filtered. This is the first thing.

Second. He predetermined the life of each and made them believe in the kingdom of God, which is especially clearly seen in the example of Islam. And he left people only to ask and bow. But this, again, would not have attracted the people very much, because there were also quite independent individuals, at all times. He struck them down with “moral” commandments, as Marx-Lenin later did – with “universal justice”, supposedly, “the land to the peasants, and the factories to the workers”. So moral commandments are the cornerstone, and total obedience is the sauce for the cutlet. But it is precisely this “sauce” that is the goal of Christ, and not “morality” at all. He already knew about the effectiveness of moral propaganda. But having received total obedience, it was possible to build an empire. On an ideological basis. In which, by right of the most intellectually developed, the Jews would receive power.

Undoubtedly, Christ did not want church power, but imperial power. That is why in the Apocalypse there are seven churches headed by “angels” and not a single patriarch, their submission is directly to Christ, God, or better yet, “the God of gods” or “the Shah of Shahs”. Here we should go directly to the Apocalypse, but I will be patient.

I will better note for now a certain amount of pretense in the Jews' dislike of Christ. It shows in the fact that they stopped talking about the Jews not only in the Bible, but also in history, and lost their homeland altogether. And so that it would not be too funny, they assigned Palestine as their homeland. But it is still funny. And not only because Palestine does not correspond at all to the "promised land" either biblically or in reality, but because, knowing everything about every people and country, right down to the pharaohs' dinner menu and the time they went to bed every night, we have known nothing about the Jews for some time now. They have become like phantoms. And how they ended up everywhere is also a mystery. And notice, no one even tries to recognize her. As if no one needs it.

And the last thing. It must be admitted from a purely logical standpoint that the Jews got nothing but benefit from Jesus Christ, but not harm at all. The Jews stuck to their Deuteronomy, and everyone else, with the help of Christ, was given the "First Law" under the name of Deuteronomy, which obviously led to a dead end, from which Moses pulled them out. And not only to a dead end, as it led the Jews in their time, but also to the subordination of the nations "wandering in darkness" to them, the Jews, who already professed what the nations would come to in 2000 years with the greatest exertion of spiritual forces. And not all of them, but only the prosperous West today.

3. Apocalypse

I will begin with a quote from a quote. M.M. Postnikov (Vol. 1) cites a quote from Trels-Lund "Heaven and Worldview in the Cycle of Times". (Odessa, 1921): "The first inevitable consequence of stargazing or astrology was a new division of time according to the number of planets… each of them influences its own specific day. Thus, a new week arose, consisting of seven days, and having application only in astrology. (…) In the end, it triumphed everywhere". Then he quotes "The History of Superstition and Magic" by Lehmann (Moscow, 1900): "It is believed that the most ancient was the Egyptian version, in which the first day was the day of Saturn (Saturday in English is still called Saturday), the second was the day of the Sun, Sunday (English Sunday) … I will note, by the way, that thus the astrological week began with the Jewish Sabbath.

I have cited this quote because Postnikov beats around the bush on many pages to finally say: "Among all the biblical books, the Apocalypse was one of the first...", that is, he finally took the side of the Tübingen school, and moreover, called its author Christ. And this is connected with the fact that the Apocalypse is almost entirely based on astrology, which, meanwhile, Christian hierarchs hate and consider devilish. But this is so, by the way.

Generally speaking, astrology itself simply could not have arisen where the sky is covered with clouds almost all year round, that is, in Europe, which is heavily dependent on the Gulf Stream in this regard. The best place for its emergence is Arabia and Egypt, where you can admire the night sky all year round, especially if you take into account the absence of photography in those days. This means that astrology was available to Jewish traders, and their compulsory literacy for all men (Talmud or Torah, I can't remember now) made it possible to write down and analyze something even during daytime leisure. And if they were going to write the Bible, then from its very first page they could not help but insert interesting things that are still of interest to almost the majority of the Earth's population. I say this because the Apocalypse did not necessarily depend on astrology, the entire Bible depended on astrology. Therefore, it is not astrology that determines the Apocalypse, but the need for it. It was possible to admire the stars even before the "First Law", because admiring and thinking are different things. That is why I cited at the beginning of Section 2.2 the quote about "alpha and omega", which replaced "I am the first and I am the last". That is

why I emphasized that Saturday was first a Jewish holiday, and then an Egyptian one, although Egypt, as I have already reported, was then in Arabia itself or Asia Minor. That is why I approve of Postnikov for “ancientizing” the Apocalypse, although he did not follow through with this matter consistently.

In general, it turns out that the “Apocalypse” (I will put it in quotation marks for now) as a horror story was needed by everyone and always, from the very beginning, as soon as people began to think, first of all – the Jews. Of course, it was not called the Apocalypse then, but the Old Testament is full of such horror stories. And even earlier it was simply in oral form. Like our “bogeyman” for children. And astrology was connected to it, even in oral form, because, indeed, there is a lot of interesting stuff in astrology, for example, horoscopes, which quite accurately characterize people to this day. And horoscopes of the future are not completely without foundation either. Otherwise they would have been forgotten long ago and not compiled, and first of all in the Kremlin. There are only smart people there.

"The Apocalypse" and astrology are like a pair of boots, each of which is very insufficient. Or like scissors, which simply cannot exist in the singular. And now let us turn to the Apocalypse itself, now without quotation marks. And at the second stage - to its urgent need in its original and final form. "His head and hair are white as white wool, like snow”, that is, gray, it is impossible to say about Jesus, for he died young, and in heaven they do not age. It is not for nothing that a reasonable person, "the Archbishop of Caesarea”, talks obvious nonsense: "although for us he is new, but he is ancient, or more correctly, eternal, for his white hair testifies to this”. Rather, this is an ancient text about a single main god, for example, Yahweh, which was remade for Christ, but the "hair" was missed out through carelessness, then, through carelessness, canonized.

Canonized carelessness also shines through in the title of the "club" of the Apocalypse. Sometimes it says "I am the first and the last", sometimes "alpha and omega", and sometimes both "titles" at once. It is clear to me that while the Jews were only preparing or had already begun trading, but did not yet need literacy at the first stage, the comprehensiveness of Yahweh, naturally, was expressed in the full set of their accounts. When their first, Jewish, letters appeared, they did not immediately even guess to switch to them in the "title". And only when their letters, due to numerous penetrations through peoples, acquired a "Greek" shade, only then did "alpha and omega" get into the Apocalypse. Moreover, the Russian translation of the Apocalypse radically puts everything in its place: Christ “is the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end”, and Sunderland, reading the Apocalypse somewhere else, is still embarrassed: “I am the alpha and omega”, as Yahweh says (about) himself in Isaiah: “I am the first and I am the last”. Do you feel the difference?

Through an oversight, several more fragments from the earlier version of the “horror story” got in, for example, these: “…who say about themselves that they are Judeans, but they are not…”, “…you allow the woman Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess…”, to which the same commentator adds: “heresy, **figuratively** called Jezebel”. This can be continued, but why? Those who wish can find even greater anachronisms in the Apocalypse, which Christ could not even dream of until he became a contender for the place not so much of God as of the emperor.

This is what we will talk about. But first, I will put an end to it. Horror stories served the Judeans, then they began to serve everyone else, including Christians and Muslims. We cannot do without them either, like “at least there would be no war”. I have already said that Christ created seven churches, according to the number of “God’s” days in the week, making himself king over them. But it is completely natural that

God, as a rule, almost without exception, is feared and “obeyed” by everyone. And completely “automatically”, even secretly from everyone, to themselves, so to speak. Which cannot be said about kings. The kings’ subjects, especially those of the highest rank, “get out of line” every now and then, which is evident even from today’s newspapers. And the higher the rank, the more painful the “disobedience” is, it is not for nothing that again, a new “vertical” is now being built in Russia to replace the collapsed one.

The Apocalypse is mainly dedicated to this “vertical”, and to the people in particular, for the especially literate. "The Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last" lists in detail: "to the churches ("provinces") of Asia ("empire") of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodacea", as if this were a resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and not the Apocalypse. Moreover, in one person this "alpha and omega" and the pre-KGB, for on almost every page he repeats, in place and out of place: "I know your deeds ...”. At the same time, he adds very personally to each of his viceroys: "remember from where you have fallen and repent ...”, unobtrusively: "... however, you are rich", "... you live where Satan's throne is", you "put to death my faithful witness Antipas". You can continue the research yourself, without me, there are a ton of these "KGB" pearls. "Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last" directly intimidates its "unit" chiefs: "I will find (attack) you like a thief (robber)", "and you will not know what hour I will find you". "I will shut you up", he say, "so that no one will open it". And how do you like: "Hold fast what you have, so that no one will take your crown"? Or: "He who overcomes I will make a pillar...”

However, it is not without exhortations and even some familiarity, as we used to praise the "Stakhanovite": "...they will come and bow down before your feet, they will know that I have loved you"; "...then I will save you from the hour...”; "...I will let you sit with me on my throne, as I sat with my father on his throne”. But this is too much..., I will finish. Although there is enough "material" for a separate article.

Postnikov said without me that Christ wrote the Apocalypse. But he did not explain why he wrote it. Firstly, the fact is that Jesus did not write the Apocalypse for the Jews, but for the peoples through whom the Jews were filtered, of which there turned out to be a whole bunch, although only seven are mentioned, for Kabbalah. Therefore, the Apocalypse is, first of all, a circular message. The circular letter with examples of the negative actions of “individual leaders” is good because it creates in each “governor” not only an impression of himself, but also of the all-pervasiveness of Jesus’ “army of cloak and dagger”, and that all of them, individually and in a heap, are under Jesus’ hood. But the very need for Jesus’ circular letter shows that his empire is not homogeneous, and that “heresies” can be expected every now and then, if not a direct war of liberation. And the “circular letter” at least makes it clear to all these “swindlers” at once what I said just above.

Secondly, the very principle on which Jesus created the empire is not very good, and Moses proved this with his forced transition from the “First Law” to Deuteronomy. But another principle of “unifying peoples under one scepter” has not yet been invented. And the Jews needed to move freely and spread out evenly “for feeding” in this “rough terrain”. That’s why they didn’t object, they even welcomed it in their hearts, although they didn’t express their gratitude to Jesus out loud. They were smart, they understood that empires couldn’t exist forever on such a principle. Well, they thought, we’ll live as long as we can, and then we’ll ask some other Jesus to come up with something new, more reliable, like fascism or communism.

It seems that I’ve answered all the questions highlighted in the previous section. Including the question: why did they include the Apocalypse in the Christian cult? For intimidation.

4. Islam, which is closer to Judaism than to Christianity,

but “came into existence” with it – at the same time

I have long been convinced and have shown evidence of this conviction in my works that Christianity and Islam are two of a kind. And they “came into existence” at the same time, if you don’t count the difference of several decades. Those years that were needed for the so carefully patronized "governors" with the help of the Apocalypse to quietly, as they say, create their own sect. Without changing, of course, the basic principles, but simply by presenting themselves as reformers and forcing the people, for example, to cross themselves with three fingers instead of two. And by overcoming their fear of that very "alpha and omega, the first and the last”. However, historians do not agree with me; for them, Islam is always "younger" for some reason. Probably because Islam seems to have no Apocalypse, but everyone knows how harshly Islam treats "infidels”.

Postnikov (Vol. 3): "The unexpected appearance of this culture" (the Arab Renaissance), its rapid development and sudden disappearance are striking”. But, "the works in which Arab scholars were significantly ahead of their time became known only much later, after European scholars had independently rediscovered their results”. (For example, Arabic numerals, I will add, smiling). Therefore, "wasn't Islam, at its inception, just one of the early Christian sects, which in the process of further evolution completely diverged from evangelical Christianity?" "For the Gospels are familiar to the Koran”. "The ideology and dogma of the Koran are also similar to the biblical ones. The most important difference is the denial of the trinity of God”.

I immediately sense a small catch here. Postnikov began to "fence off" Islam from the Gospels, completely forgetting that Judaism has always existed right next to Islam. If this were just one example, then we could remain silent. But there are hundreds of such examples. And this directly indicates that they are trying in every possible way not to remember the Jews. But I like the general tone of the simultaneity of Islam and Christianity. And if we also take into account that the so-called Nestorianism, from which the Orthodox faith "emerged", and from the latter - Orthodoxy, and all of them used both the cross and the crescent as an emblem on an equal basis, moreover, "in one package", then in Postnikov's place I would say: Islam and Christianity are derivatives of Judaism, developed by the Jews specifically for non-Jews. Moreover, even before the creation of the Gospels and the Koran. The Gospels and the Koran are the final stage of the Jesus revolution, which began with the idea of returning to the First Law, advanced by a properly edited ancient Apocalypse and fell apart into two movements after the death of Christ. Details in the book and a series of articles under the general heading "Yesterday".

However, Postnikov continues: "... it turns out that the territorial unity of the Koran can only be ensured by book printing”. "The late composition of the Koran is also indicated by the prohibition of wine in it, while, for example, in the tales of "1001 Nights" there is no such prohibition”. You see, Postnikov really wants to divert us from what he himself has just said, all the way to the 15th century. And as for wine, Nosovsky and Fomenko provide convincing evidence that this collection of tales actually came into being during the Renaissance. In addition, I have proven that "Russian" vodka was invented by the Jews, because they saw that they could not cope with the Russian "hot drink", and that it would be better to use it for their own benefit, greatly reducing its cost and driving the "Rusichi" into bondage almost for free. The prohibition of drinking wine in the Koran should be sought not in Christ and Christianity, but in one of the successors of Christ, who thought that it would be better this way, since in the south they were not yet accustomed to drinking as much as in the north. It is evident in the Scandinavians, and in the Germans, and in the Finns.

And among the southern peoples there are always and everywhere fewer drunkards. They all have things "hotter" than wine - drugs. Moreover, starting with Yemen and Ethiopia.

In general, Postnikov quite often forgets that he wrote recently. Maybe because I "pull" quotes from different places of the three-volume work into one pile? Here: "It is interesting that Europe learned about the Koran very late, they thought about translating the Koran only in the 12th century". "The belief in the existence of Mohammed in the 7th century is not based on anything real". "We see that the real biographies of Mohammed are the creation of the 16th - 17th centuries". But he already said that the Koran is impossible without a printing press.

I will group the following opus from Postnikov. "Despite the long political existence of Byzantium next to the Caliphate, the volume of Byzantine reports on the internal life of the Caliphate, its culture and religion is surprisingly small. Particularly striking is the almost complete absence of Byzantine information on Mohammedanism". "Instead of "Muslim" and "Mohammedan", only "Saracen", "Agaryan", and "Esmaelite" are used". "And "Agaryans" and "Esmaelites" go back to the Bible".

Postnikov again does not specify that it is to the Jewish Old Testament that the Hagarenes and Esmaelites "ascend", and therefore he can go on to say, erasing the concept of a Judean from our consciousness, that "the Hagarenes were religiously close to Christians not only objectively, but also subjectively, that is, that they did not separate themselves from other Christians, nor did the great mass of other Christian sects consider their faith non-Christian".

And Postnikov, apparently, does not care that the Koran interprets Christ and all his relatives extremely offensively, that in this same book he writes about Christ as the inventor and introducer of wine drinking. He insists on his own: "... neither Byzantium nor Western Europe saw in Muslims representatives of a new special religion..". In addition, he pays absolutely no attention to the fact that by this time from Indonesia to the South of France there is a continuous belt of these same "Agaryans". And in Europe, the primary Christian sects are just "emerging", and under the leadership mainly of women, representatives and servants of the cult of mother goddesses, for whom male gods are simple servants. In other words, he immediately seized the time of the complete separation of Christians and Mohammedans and based his reasoning on this. Having made us believe that first the Christians "came", and then the Mohammedans "separated" from them. But the point here is that the very principle on which Christ wanted to make a revolution led to an inevitable split, which is evident in the example of both Christians and Mohammedans, who literally from the day of their foundation began to "bud". And today they cannot stop. And Judaism, despite the demonstration to us by historians of its fictitious sectarianism, is in fact monolithic, like a good brick.

In this connection, I can't help but suspect that Postnikov wants to tell us that "there's an elderberry in the garden, and an uncle in Kyiv". Or: "I sewed a tobacco pouch for my beloved, and it came out as a mitten". In addition, he really wants to present Morozov's rather clear concept of the origin of the Bible "near Vesuvius" to us in such a way that we would not understand anything at all and would become completely confused, completely forgetting about the Jews. That's why his three volumes came out just when we had already begun to understand something. He's not the only one who thinks so. For example, as soon as the people began to show a dislike for the Jews (Makashov), it immediately turned out, judging by the newspapers and the "box", that almost all the Heroes of the Soviet Union who defended the country from German fascism were Jews.

I'll move on to Postnikov's interpretation of the Arabs to confirm my suspicions. "The theory of the gradual formation of the Islamic faith outlined above (which I called "an elderberry in the garden, and an uncle in Kyiv") implies that Islam (in the form of Agaryanism) had its beginnings anywhere but on the Arabian Peninsula". And it is not only Islam that could not "arise" here. In general, "the emergence of some religious and cultural movement in the geographical and socio-economic conditions of ancient Arabia seems incredible". I think he is hinting at Judaism, since some scholars believe that the Jewish religion arose precisely in the south of Arabia and in Ethiopia, but there are the same "Fasters" even in "Britannica", which is now published in the USA, and therefore "Britannica" informs everyone who wants to know that "this has not been proven". I examined this issue in detail in my book "The Mysterious Russian Soul against the Background of World Jewish History" and my other works, and I believe that Judaism arose precisely there, on the basis of the "trading" tribes of the former Bedouins. And it is precisely from the heaviness of life in these sands that makes the head work better than, for example, in paradise.

But Postnikov and I understand the word "conquest" differently, he - straightforwardly, and I - figuratively. He says that "backward" conquerors (military) would quickly dissolve in a more powerful cultural environment, like some Huns among the Romans. And I say that smarter "trader tribes", combing through more backward peoples like a comb through hair, completely peacefully "conquered" primacy among them.

James Frazer - this fount of knowledge about the aborigines of all continents, was very surprised that American Indians, living in the most favorable conditions, turn out to be the most backward in comparison with those Indians who live in extreme conditions. Then I chose from him the peoples living "in paradise" and the peoples living "in hell", and put them in two piles. Doubts finally disappeared. This is the law: in extreme conditions - people are smarter. All that was needed was to make the greatest discovery: to overcome shame and start trading, because there is no such thing as trade without deception. And there is no trade without literacy, at least, what - at what price? Well, and all sorts of receipts, bills of exchange for a start. Here I should once again go over to the ancient Hebrew language, its "vowel marks" due to the use of only consonants, and finish with the "Indo-European family of languages", in which in all languages numerals and pronouns "I - you", "mine - yours" are written the same, but we must also give the floor to Postnikov. Especially since he can not remember the Jews without extreme necessity.

Before Postnikov, "all modern researchers agree that the "Arab" culture was such only insofar as the form of its expression was the Arabic language, considered the language of an insignificant tribe of Bedouins. And it became widespread because the Koran was written in it". Postnikov puts the "horse and cart" in its place: the Arabic language, "like Latin and Hebrew (the biblical language), is an artificial, liturgical language of the Agarene sects, and like Latin in the West, it began to play the role of an international language of science over time. In relation to Latin, this was facilitated by the spread of Catholicism, and in relation to Arabic, by the spread of Islam". Putting the "horse and cart" in their place, Postnikov obviously completely forgot that about fifty pages later he spoke about the "origin" of Sanskrit from European Latin. How did Latin "jump" over Islam and Arabic? After all, all these languages are "liturgical". And why did it "jump" anyway? Again, "elder and uncle". However, before Postnikov there were "elder and uncle". Moreover, Postnikov, as they say, out of place, remarks: "By the way, the Arabic language of the Koran is very close to the Hebrew language of the Bible, and Hebraists can read "in Arabic", and Arabists – "in Hebrew", but… "the reference to this closeness to justify the origin of Islam from the vicinity of Mecca is

completely untenable". As they say: here we go… Postnikov does not develop the topic of languages any further: he set traps for us, led the "Poles" into the wilderness like Susanin, and himself – into the bushes…

But I have already written about this.

5. Slander against Christ

As you have probably noticed, I do not really admire Christ. He spoke more than his mother, about whom the Qur'an exclaims: O Mariam, sister of Harun (**Aaron**), you have done the unheard of…". But I do not want to allow Postnikov to slander him either. Postnikov (Vol. 2): "What form did this religion initially take in the hands of Jesus, the Great King:

1. The Great King introduced some new element into the ritual, rejected by the Old Believers, the **Aaronites** (emphasized by me), but enthusiastically accepted by the broad masses of believers. This element made such an impression that the Great King began to be equated with God.

2. The Great King founded the liturgy (from the words "lite" – common prayer and "orgy" – mysterious sacrifice), the main component of which was the rite of communion with bread and wine. There is no reason to believe that his liturgy has come down to us in its original form. On the contrary, one should expect that it has been significantly modified many times. In particular, it is completely unknown how much bread and wine the Great King used in his liturgy.

3. The wine-making process is a very subtle and non-trivial operation, the a priori existence of which does not follow from anywhere, and which had to be discovered. We have no reason to believe that the wine-making culture was known before the 4th century AD; on the other hand, it is clear that the person who first discovered this process made a gigantic revolution in the life of society.

4. The effect of wine on a person must have seemed to people who encountered it for the first time to be something miraculous and supernatural, the infusion of a new spirit into the body, direct contact with the deity. It is not for nothing that "spirit", "soul" and "spirit" are written the same way – spiritus.

5. For this reason, the person who invented wine, or at least applied it to religious purposes, must have been considered by all those around him to be especially close to God, the son of God, and even God himself.

All this makes Morozov's hypothesis very plausible, who believes that Jesus' main innovation was the introduction of wine during church services. Bacchus-Dionysus is just another interpretation of Jesus Christ. The Gospel story of Jesus turning water into wine in Cana of Galilee is also significant. St. Jerome claims that, according to the tradition received from the apostles, the day will come when grapes will grow, each bush of which will have ten thousand vines, each vine - ten thousand shoots, each shoot - ten thousand branches, on each branch there will be ten thousand bunches, each consisting of ten thousand berries, which will give twenty-five measures of wine. And when the saint wants to pick the berries from one bunch, the neighboring bunch will exclaim: "I am the best, take me and thank God..."

In 1873, the "Didache" was found: "We thank you, our father, for the holy grapes of David, your servant, which you showed us through Jesus, your servant". The logical consequence of introducing the cult of wine into worship is its transformation into a Bacchic orgy. In the reports of the most orthodox church leaders, one can find clear indications that before the church revolution of the 11th century, bacchanalia was an integral part of the Christian cult". End of quote.

I will begin with the "very subtle and non-trivial operation" of winemaking. South American monkeys, not to mention Saint Jerome of Galilee, I just forgot what kind, because I saw it in "The Animal World", do not eat some sugary, ripe fruits, but put them out in the sun and wait for them to ferment. And then they eat, though, slightly wincing, because unfermented ones are tastier. On TV, they wince just like we do when we drink. And then they have fun, so much so that they fall off the branches. Which never happens to sober monkeys. Then, naturally, they fall asleep, like you and me, in a very uncomfortable position. So Postnikov greatly exaggerates the difficulties of inventing wine. Vodka is another matter. Here, yes, the technology is subtle, you don't figure it out right away, a lot of knowledge and practice are needed. It is not for nothing that when the Russian government decided to eliminate the Jews from making vodka, and had already written a decree, it itself then canceled it: until Russian craftsmen acquired experience. I even wrote a special article about this, to present the Jews in relation to "Russian" vodka more vividly, or rather, fairly. I remove this slander from Jesus Christ.

As for his introduction of the "communion" of wine until drunk, this is also nonsense. If monkeys drink, then people, even primitive ones, were ordered to do so by God himself, as they say. Moreover, the god is still the same, or rather the mother goddess, for example, another of the first, Cybele, Gaia or Aphrodite. This is what attracted people to temples, and it got to the point of drunkenness that drunken men castrated themselves "in honor" of the goddess, and ran along the street, showing off, and splashing blood in all directions. By the way, in our country a scopist is a kazhennik in Russian (Dal). And "scope", as you know, I look too, where the telescope comes from. And now think about it. It was so fun and good in the temple, even after drinking, you could "sin" more seriously, with women, and quite openly. And then Christ appears with his universal love and the Apocalypse under his arm, and forbids. The first Christians would have kicked him out of the temple even more than Pilate with the "Pharisees and scribes". So they had to resign themselves and accept the "rules of the game", and only gradually, already under Cosimo Medici, who convened the Ferrara-Florence Council, the struggle took the form of the famous "Malleus" - to burn these "witches" mercilessly. They were weaned off.

And it was not wine that advanced the teaching of Christ, but precisely the Apocalypse. Although for some peoples who have never dealt with alcohol, wine is a thing worse than heroin, which you try once and disappear.

As for the "origin" of Islam, Orthodox faith, Orthodoxy and Catholicism, I have - in other works.

6. What was the medieval Western Christian cult and when was it?

This section is almost entirely a quotation (G.V. Nosovsky, A.T. Fomenko. “Rus’ i Rim”, v.1, “AST Publishing House”, Moscow, 1999. Pp.166-171). Perhaps that is why Postnikov “parted ways” with these authors and published his “earlier” work in three volumes after their publications? It seems that Morozov, who had been forgotten by almost everyone, needed to be “updated”, but not by reissuing his multi-volume work “Christ”, but by “interpreting” Morozov to the burning issues of the day. The burning issue of the day was undoubtedly the numerous works of the aforementioned authors, which had received a great deal of attention, in which some things were “distorted”. I am not thrilled with some of these authors' "interpretations" of history, for example, that Russia once ruled the entire world, but this does not prevent me from agreeing with them on other issues where I see good logic. I will allow myself to interrupt the long quotation at the place I need and comment.

So, "What do we know today about Western European monasticism in the Middle Ages? Let's open, for example, the book by Alexander Paradisis, "The Life and Work of Balthazar Cossa "Pope John XXIII" (Minsk, 1980). "Not a trace remained of the hermitic and pious life of the monasteries of the first centuries of Christianity, the decay of the church and morals in them reached incredible proportions... The nuns' clothing, which emphasized their natural beauty and slenderness, did not contribute to the strictness of morals... Almost all the monasteries of Italy", writes Rodokanaki, "accepted male visitors..". We learn about the life of the monasteries in Venice not only from Casanova. San Didier writes: "Nothing in Venice aroused such interest as the monasteries". Nobles were also frequent visitors there. And since all the nuns were beautiful and slender, not one of them was left without a lover. And the care of the matrons for morals was expressed in the fact that they helped the nuns find more skillful ways of meeting lovers and covering for them... In many monasteries, theaters were set up, and performances were allowed, but only nuns could act in them... The nuns of Genoa were not distinguished by restraint either. One of the papal decrees noted with regret: "The sisters from the monasteries of St. Philip and St. James wander the streets of Genoa, committing indecent acts that their unbridled fantasy dictates to them...".

I will interrupt the quote to remind you about opera castrati. Opera composers did not invent them themselves. Composers do not invent voices, they simply use existing voices in their works, male and female. And church composers do not invent voices either, but use those that exist. But if, for example, a church performance required a prophet with a rather thunderous voice, otherwise he would not be a prophet, and in these performances "only nuns were allowed to play", then it was necessary to look for a nun with at least a contralto. And such a nun could be found. There were plenty of angelic children's voices among nuns. But the Medici revolution broke out, and all the nuns were kicked out of the churches. From now on, only men could sing in the Catholic Church, including with angelic voices. That's when castrati were needed in churches, since castration is a less painful and more humane replacement for emasculation, which was widespread in the cult of mother goddesses. With castration, a man wants to, but cannot, has nothing to do with it. With castration, he doesn't even want to.

I continue quoting: "The new Western European Evangelical Church of the 14th-16th centuries persecuted this Bacchic-Christian cult: "The licentiousness of the nuns in the Bolognese monastery of John the Baptist was so great that the authorities were forced to disperse all the nuns and close the monastery. The nuns from the monastery of St. Leonard were given under the supervision of the monastery of St. Lawrence, whose strict and cruel rules earned him the reputation of the "executioner" of nuns… The number of nuns persecuted by justice for licentiousness grew every day. Each Bolognese monastery had a nickname: "the monastery of dolls", "the monastery of gossips", "the monastery of the penitent Magdalenes", "the monastery of shameless women", "the monastery of the Messalinas"... The famous humanist Pontano said that in Valencia the Spaniards freely entered the women's monasteries and that it was difficult to draw a line between these holy monasteries and houses of bad reputation".

Let's stop for a minute and think.

We are faced with the question: what was the Western European Christian cult like before the 13th-14th centuries A.D.? Is it similar to today's? Today we are assured that before the 14th-16th centuries "the clergy spent their time in bacchanalia". We have heard about the unbridled debauchery to which many medieval monks allegedly indulged, distorting the originally pure ideals of Christianity. An unbiased study of medieval documents shows that this cult practically coincided with what we today consider a "pagan, Bacchic, ancient cult". Morozov cited numerous testimonies that, for example, official prostitution was an integral part of

medieval Christian worship in Western Europe. It is possible that all these "traces of antiquity" seem strange today only because they contradict the Scaligerian chronology. By changing the chronology, we will eliminate the apparent contradiction. Let us dwell on this problem in more detail.

Apparently, the Western European Christian cult in the Middle Ages coincided with the "ancient", Bacchic cult. Many traces of that worship have been preserved in Scaligerian history. For example, today it is believed that the medieval papacy and monasticism were mired in debauchery (the famous "agapes" - "nights in love", "love feasts" were dedicated not to friendly libations, but to Bacchic orgies). Of course, it was not easy to destroy the Bacchic cult; the church devoted many years to the fight against it. Later, in particular, the Inquisition was called upon to do this. The famous medieval descriptions of "devil's sabbaths" have as their prototypes all the same "agapes" - bacchanalia, but transformed (from the point of view of the church reformers of the 14th-16th centuries) into "the work of the devil".

Despite the success of the reformism (not to be confused with the Reformation, but to be understood as the Renaissance, although it was not a revival at all, but a simple forceful overcoming of matriarchy - my note), the Bacchic Christian cult held on for a long time in Western Europe. For example, here is Champfleury's book "History of Caricature in the Middle Ages". Usually, a caricature uses real features in order to distort them and draw special attention to them.

Champfleury wrote: "Strange amusements (from the point of view of modern history. - Auth.) took place in cathedrals and monasteries during major church holidays in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Not only the lower clergy took part in merry dances and songs, especially at Easter and Christmas, but even the most important church dignitaries. The monks of the male monasteries then danced with the nuns of the neighboring convents, and the bishops joined in their merriment". And then Champfleury, as the most modest example, passing it off as a caricature (!), cites an image of a supper of monks "and their lovers" from the 14th century Bible (from the Bible!), stored under No. 166 in the Paris National Library. The miniature depicts a typical Bacchic situation: one of the monks in the foreground indulges in love games with a nun, in the background the same thing is repeated on a mass scale. The number of such "caricatures" in medieval texts and Bibles is quite large. By the way, Pope Pius II (1405-1464), for example, is the author of erotic works and an extremely obscene (by modern standards) comedy "Christ". Let us also mention the famous "Song of Songs", included in the biblical canon and also permeated with frank eroticism (interpreted by modern theologians as "allegory"). (I would like to note in parentheses that Pope Pius II was the same age as Cosimo de' Medici).

Such illustrations, including those in the Bible, are possible only if they depict the usual way of life of the Western European medieval clergy, a fact that is generally recognized as normal; and if the artist had done this with the aim of condemning customs that had ceased to be approved under the new ideology, then, as N. A. Morozov noted, he would have depicted this feast in some disgusting form, with devils dragging sinners to hell, with the ugly consequences of diseases. Instead, many medieval Bibles are illustrated not only with images of bacchanalia, but also with "antique drawings": bunches of grapes, on which angels climb, indistinguishable from antique cupids, etc.

As early as the 7th century AD, the Council of Chalon-sur-Saone allegedly forbade women from singing indecent songs in churches. Bishop Gregory of Tours (6th century) protested against the monastic masquerades in Poitiers, which were of an unbridled nature. Champfleury writes: "Only in 1212 did the Paris Council forbid nuns to organize "mad holidays" in the following form: "to abstain everywhere from

mad holidays where the phallus is accepted, and this we forbid even more strongly to monks and nuns". The prohibitions were of little help. Thus, in 1245, the renovationist bishop Odon, having visited the Rouen monasteries, reported that nuns indulged in indecent pleasures on a massive scale there, during the holidays. From all this it is clear with what difficulty (and how late) the new evangelical papacy eradicated the deeply rooted Bacchic cult.

"More than once", notes Champfleury, "when I was examining ancient cathedrals, trying to find the secret of their confusing, obscene ornamentation, all my explanations seemed to me to be commentaries on a book written in some language alien to me... What should we think, for example, of the strange sculpture placed in the shadow under a column in the underground hall of the medieval cathedral in Bourges?" This sculpture is a man's buttocks protruding from a column in a passionate pose, executed carefully and expressively. The sculpture is placed in a place convenient for love games. How could the monks and parishioners who constantly used this temple tolerate such a sculpture, before this sculpture began to be preserved as a relic of bygone days? Attempts to explain such sculptures and images (and quite a few have survived!) by the fact that they are "caricatures" carved in stone, in sacred temples, of those who serve in them, are frivolous".

N. A. Morozov wrote: "But an excess of modesty deprives us of important scientific knowledge. The newest historians, keeping silent about Christian images of genitals in some rooms of ancient churches, throw a veil over the thought of someone who would like to compare monuments of classical antiquity with monuments of the Middle Ages. Serious books on the cult of the phallus with the help of serious drawings would illuminate this subject brightly and would reveal the worldview of those who, even in the Middle Ages, could not yet get rid of pagan cults".

All these images mentioned here are in no way a mockery of the church, but have the same purely inviting meaning (before the deployment of wide repressions of the new evangelical church against the old cult), as the images of mugs of foaming beer on the doors of pubs. The famous pornographic images of "antiquity", discovered, for example, in Pompeii, are practically indistinguishable from these Christian sculptures and drawings. And again, "modesty" prevents the general scientific community from becoming familiar with these numerous images. It turns out that "those of the paintings that depict some sharply erotic and indecent scenes, so beloved by the ancients (let us add — and in the Middle Ages. — Author), are kept under lock and key… Someone secretly… scraped off the obscene frescoes with a knife at night… Recently, all the Pompeian paintings and sculptures that are incompatible with modern concepts of decency are kept in a secret section of the Bourbon museum". Houses with stone phalluses attached to the entrances have been discovered in Pompeii. Erotic sculptures of Western European Christian cult are found on the capitals of the Magdeburg Cathedral, on the walls of the famous Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris in the 12th century, etc.

In the archaeology of medieval Rome, it is well known that the buildings of almost all the main Roman Christian churches were erected "on the ruins" of former pagan temples, and these supposedly "previous pagan sanctuaries" were approximately the same purpose and even the same name as the Christian ("later") temples. Apparently, having declared its Bacchic past (which lasted until the 14th-15th centuries A.D.) "erroneous", the Western European Christian church, having entered a new, stricter phase in the 15th-16th centuries, simply renamed its pagan-Bacchic temples" (end of quote).

It is not without reason that I have cited such a long excerpt from the book of the aforementioned authors. It shows the inseparable connection between Christianity and pre-Christianity in the "method" of attracting people to temples. But since no one doubts that the pre-Christian cult is polytheism, there should be no doubt that Christ used the “base passions of the people”, and it was these passions, not his “Sermon on the Mount” and “healings”, that gave rise to the spread of Christianity. And Christ understood this perfectly well.

Let us consider the dates, but not their absolute values, since they are false, but the difference between them. Christ was born in the year zero and died in the year 33 of the new era. The Christian church “liberated itself” from the “cult” of pagan polytheism in the 15th – 16th centuries. So what does this mean? Has the Christian church been standing with its legs spread wide for 1,500 years? How long did Marx’s “eternal” teaching exist in the form of a guide to action, counting from the famous Manifesto of 1847? Only 150 years, today this Manifesto is not even in the Great Encyclopedic Dictionary of 1997. And this in Russia, which lived under communist rule for 70 years.

And what is "primary Christianity" with this continuously functioning "cult" described above, stretching for 1500 years, until the first edition of the "Malleus" in 1486 and during its 28 editions until 1600? This is utter stupidity. Marx died in 1883, and already in 1917, 34 years later, Lenin realized his idea. And it did not take 1500 years of "intermediate stage" for there to be both capitalism and socialism. Therefore, I have no doubt that Christianity reached Western Europe just before Cosimo de' Medici, and he and his heirs "corrected" Christianity with the Malleus.

But it also cannot be that Christianity galloped “from Syria” to Florence for about 1400 years, since the Medici organized the Ferrara-Florence Council in 1438, and already in 1486 the Malleus was being printed with all its might. Where was it? What took so long? And Christ died about 1400 years ago. And if Christianity galloped earlier, despite the aforementioned “council”, then all the orgies, and the “early Christian” orgies, could not have continued for 1400 years, until the Medici took up their eradication? And besides, we don’t hear much about orgies in Syria itself. How did they cope with these orgies there? Or were they not there at all? And in Constantinople, and in Greece, where Christianity supposedly “flourished magnificently”.

And wine, “invented” by Christ according to Postnikov. All these questions can be applied to it, as well as to “early Christian orgies”. As is well known, there are no orgies without wine, you have to “relax” first to start the orgies. Only in porn films are the heroes sober, they are “at work”. Try to force a Russian, or any foreign, man to take part not only in orgies, but even to “pick up” a prostitute sober. In general, Christianity could not have been hanging around, God knows where, before it got to Western Europe. And it definitely ended up in Western Europe somewhere before the Ferrara-Florence Council, not much earlier, and not much later. And, judging by the teachings of Marx, this “not much” is no more than 50 years old. So we cannot send Jesus Christ to the foggy distance of time, “prehistoric”. Well, it is still possible to direct it back a hundred years to the Ferrara-Florence Cathedral, but no more, because in a hundred years almost everything is forgotten, especially with such writing, without vowels. And we must not forget that scientific and technical progress soars at an exponent that is too steep. From the steam locomotive and steamship to today's microelectronics and other modern wonders, including cellular video communication, only a hundred years have passed, do you feel the "spin" of this function? And here 6000 years - and everything is almost "horizontal". And Islam, as a brother of Christianity and both of them - from Judaism, should not jump far back into the depths of the centuries.

Now we must return to the Jews again, forgetting about ancient Babylon, Egypt, Byzantium and other "empires", including the Roman, or rather, not about them per se, but about their chronological "beginning". All this must be brought closer to the Christianity of the Ferrara-Florence Council, because its date is exact. I think that 500 years, at most 1000, will be enough for all this, including Moses. And now tell me a country where there are no Jews? How long did it take them to comb through all the nations and settle in them almost evenly (up to 5 percent)? For clarity, I will draw your attention to the time of settlement of other peoples across the planet, starting with the Japanese. Exactly 150 years ago, not a single Japanese was outside of Japan. And in Japan itself, there was not a single foreigner, excluding the Dutch trading post. Let's take the Chinese. They got to Southeast Asia earlier, and they appeared in Europe and America almost simultaneously, also about 200 years ago, no more. And today, Chinese restaurants are scattered around the planet almost more often than McDonald's. And McDonald's itself "conquered" the entire world in just 50 years, although they are not a nation. The Italians began to "develop" Europe beyond the Alps en masse after World War II, and the Arabs - after the Italians. Today you can see for yourself how many of them there are in Northern Europe. The same with Africans. It is at this very time that the peak of their settlement across the planet is observed. Yes, what am I saying? After all, in all of Russia, out of all the Africans before 1975, there was only one Paul Robeson, and he was from America. And for only a week. Of course, I am not counting Pushkin.

I want to say that it does not take much time or even planes to settle peoples, ships, some roads, and horses will suffice. And there is absolutely no need for wars, I especially note this. Otherwise you will think that I used the Second World War as a reason for resettlement. For me it only played the role of a date that almost everyone remembers. This means that the Jews did not need thousands of years to master all the continents. They needed much less time for this than other peoples. Because all other peoples arrange their colonies in any other country, places of their almost universal concentration. You see, it is easier for them to live this way, without learning a foreign language properly and without adopting “foreign” rules of everyday behavior. But the Jews, on the contrary, were driven into ghettos, forcibly concentrated in a bunch, which, imagine, they did not like. Because literature is full of complaints about “Jewish” ghettos. And since these complaints are full not only of Jewish literature, but also of the "national" literature of the country where they lived, it is quite obvious that almost all the literature of this country belonged to Jews. Or were Remarque and Feuchtwanger, who lived in Germany, not Jews?

I have already written about the desire of Jews to settle among foreign people more evenly and the reason for this. But this does not mean that Jews are equally ready to populate, for example, Greenland. Their attraction to warm regions is well known. For example, in Russia they like to live not only in warm regions (it is also warm in Central Asia), but preferably closer to the sea: Crimea, Odessa. Although in Kharkov they are almost a third. It is just that no one in the country wants to count them. And as soon as they start counting, they immediately change their surnames. But I did not start this paragraph for this, but in order to move on to Italy - the cradle of Catholicism. It is also a very warm country, almost the same as their historical homeland, which I still found, despite their resistance. But the main thing is that there is a sea around, just like in their historical homeland - the coastal beach of Yemen. And wherever Christ was born, on the shores of the Persian Gulf, in Yemen itself, or on the shores of Ethiopia, which was Eritrea and Axum at that time, his “disciples” had to get to Italy first, having “mastered” Greece and the shores of Asia Minor along the way. The coasts of the Iberian Peninsula, the entire coastal line of the Mediterranean Sea in general, as well as France and, of course, England, since the climate there is even milder than in France,

were also subject to “mastering”, according to the same rules. They left Germany and the north of Europe for last, and for losers. Then, however, after 100-200 years, all this leveled out to some extent, already according to the conjuncture of trade and banks, which they had always been engaged in. The island of Malta was especially good. I even think that at one time the “boot” in this very place connected with Africa, and Carthage was located somewhere here, but then sank. This is what the Jewish love of water means, which I mentioned above, in the section "Yahweh and the Sea".

That is why I assume that Islam was born somewhat earlier, just enough to have time to "conquer" in the most peaceful way, before it fell apart into Christianity and, in fact, Islam, what remains conquered by it today. But it is also undoubtedly that it was Christ who did all this, despite the fact that Islam does not consider him "its own". For in Islam, too, the "common people" must observe the "First Law" and hope for the best "there", and not "here". I have already spoken about the reasons for the collapse, but here I will only note for the second time that Islam is more primary than Christianity. This is evidenced by the monolithic nature of the Islamic religious empire from Indonesia to Gibraltar within the framework of secular states. But one should not only not say, but not even think that this was done by force of arms, for this is absolutely fantastic.

The internal contradiction of the ideology on which the empire of Christ in the form of Islam was built could not but cause sectarianism after the death of Christ, at the head of which Christian sects were his "disciples". But since the basis of these sects was still the First Law, pulled out of oblivion in Judaism, then the Christian sects were very similar to each other. Christian sectarians, in turn, forced the previously united Islam to split into sects, since the struggle against them by Islamists was not universal, but by local forces of the Islamic states, well, and ideological inconsistency arose, first in the methods of struggle, and then in the essence of the teachings of these sects. But, in general, neither Christian nor Islamic sects went too far from each other, the "First Law" and the Apocalypse did not let in.

And then, already as the main literates of the world, the Jews described all this, but in a way that was beneficial to them. But never, with rare exceptions and mistakes of "pen or stick", without mentioning themselves. That is how we lost them in the centuries, although all this was quite recently.

Therefore, this work is almost entirely devoted to the "forgotten" role of Jewry and Judaism, inseparable from the beginning to the end of centuries. Even the Frenchman Ernest Renan, an honorary academician of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences (since 1860), could not find them, despite the fact that he lived almost in those same "biblical" times, and speculatively "reached" in the old days not only to the "Roman" emperor Marcus Aurelius, but also to Christ himself. Or was he also a "French" Jew? In every work of mine where I touch on the Jews, I never tire of noticing that I admire this people who gave the world almost everything: trade, literacy, a credit system, ideology as such, science, culture, and to this day stand “ahead of the rest of the planet” in these matters. But I don’t like them. And my dislike for them is not because they are bad, but from envy of their determination, organization, and thirst to make their lives better. Deuteronomy is great, which the majority of the world’s population still needs to understand.

Judaism, Islam, Orthodox faith, Orthodoxy and Catholicism "in one bottle"

In my opinion, these religions arose in exactly this order, although official history gives them a different order of origin. And it is not for nothing that I immediately divided Christianity into three parts, which are also not quite ordinary. In history, Orthodox faith and Orthodoxy are usually considered synonyms, but, again, in my opinion, this is not quite so, or rather, not at all so. It is not for nothing that "Orthodox"

Christianity is Georgian, and Armenian, and Greek, and Serbian, and Ukrainian, and even "foreign", not to mention Russian Orthodoxy. And all these "Orthodoxies" are not entirely friendly with each other, although they observe decency, and sometimes even a "sense of camaraderie", especially when one of these "Orthodoxies" inadvertently touches on Catholicism.

So that the majority of readers who don't care about religions understand what we are talking about, I will remind you that according to official history, Judaism appeared first, and no historian objects to this. Then Christianity branched off from it, namely "Orthodox faith", which in the West is associated with Syria and Palestine, and which gradually filled first Ancient Greece, then Ancient Rome. Here, a cataclysm occurred with this Orthodox faith, which turned Orthodox faith into Catholicism, and this same Catholicism has already spread throughout Western Europe on the rights given to it by the Roman Empire. Orthodox faith did not undergo any changes, did not turn into Catholicism, only on the western coast of the Mediterranean, in Syria and Constantinople, in Greece and the Balkans. So it was "accepted" by Kievan Rus, and then by all of Russia, but for some reason under the name of Orthodoxy, simultaneously making Orthodox faith and Orthodoxy synonymous. Catholics have repeatedly tried to implant their understanding of Christianity in the vast expanses of Eastern Europe, but to no avail. Although, if we speak in detail, there were some successes. The Union between Orthodox Christianity and Catholicism was signed on unification. Russia, having signed this union, immediately refused to implement it, and smaller countries such as Ukraine, Lithuania and, in my opinion, even Smolensk began to implement this union, becoming Uniate Catholics, a somewhat offensive name as Catholics of the "second freshness". When Ukraine "voluntarily" joined Russia, its people "voluntarily" converted to Orthodoxy, providing it with their "Uniate-Catholic" churches. Today, this process, as is known, is going backwards after the even more voluntary separation of Ukraine from Russia.

As for Islam, it "emerged" later than all and prevailed for the majority of people not very interested in religion in the East: Arabia, Persia, Iraq, and so on. But somehow it is not advertised enough that Islam, practically from the day of its foundation and to this day, has been spread from Indonesia to Gibraltar in a continuous and rather wide strip covering half the Earth. Only India with its Hinduism and Buddhism has wedged itself into this strip like a foreign body. Islam “came into existence” at the request, roughly speaking, of just one former merchant, originally, it seems, from Egypt, who emigrated, having saved up money, to Arabia.

This is how the official history of the main religions looks, roughly drawn. It is not for nothing that I do not mention any dates or even centuries. The fact is that, trying to put all historical movements in order and bring them to a single time scale, historians, some for money, some out of conviction, have created such chaos that you could go crazy. This is very well said in books on the so-called new chronology, of which there are a ton, and it is extremely pleasant to read them as long as they are talking about criticizing traditional chronology. But as soon as they talk about correcting this traditional chronology “as it should be”, my interest in them often disappears, although not always. Thus, the reduction of world history, as such, from 5-6 and even from 10 thousand years to 700-1000 years seems to me to be indisputable. I especially do not like some of “our versions” of the interpretation and sequence of events, published by Nosovsky and Fomenko, but also - far from all. Some versions, mainly small-scale global cataclysms, deserve trust, at least mine. Large historical movements of peoples, such as the Russians owning the whole world, almost without exception, are too far-fetched for me. But that's just by the way.

My approach to historical events is based on the events themselves, almost without involving chronology, how these events relate to each other in their pure form. If we compare this with a children's game of cubes with pictures, then I put these cubes together, new and worn from frequent use, not paying attention to their physical wear, the main thing is to get a picture specified by the manufacturer of the toy (you can call him God). In my opinion, this is right. The cubes can even be from several games, made, some - under the tsar, others - under the communists, or even in Ancient Egypt. It is only necessary that they all belong to one game, like the Earth - to us. Then, you must agree, the age of the cubes does not matter. It is only necessary that the fragments of the picture on the cubes could be at least somewhat identified or simply recognized, and not applied to each other at random.

I used this methodical approach to write my main book, “The Mysterious Russian Soul against the Background of World Jewish History”, the title of which speaks for itself. But then, after writing it, I saw that I had interpreted some things not quite correctly, and had completely overlooked some, but they turned out to be necessary for understanding my main idea. That is why I considered myself obliged to write a series of articles, since the book itself no longer wanted to accept footnotes, which sometimes turned out to be longer than the chapter itself devoted to a specific issue.

I outlined the history of Judaism in the book and, in addition to it, in several articles. And what I got was not so much the history of Judaism, which, having arisen, has not undergone significant changes to this day, as the history of a trading tribe from Yemen, although the ancestral home of this tribe is a lifeless plateau between Yemen and Saudi Arabia, or rather, that this trading tribe is Saudi. Then it turned out that this tribe, for the first time in the history of the Earth, offered trade to the peoples, and itself undertook to carry it out on the basis of Judaism. Then this tribe went, penetrating the peoples, in different directions: to the east and to the west, but not breaking away far from the sea coast into the interior of the continent. The western part, having been in Egyptian captivity, nevertheless spread along all the shores of the Mediterranean Sea, without changing its religion. The eastern part assimilated with the royal families of the aborigines on the basis of the religion of Islam created by them, having forgotten their Judaism. But the vanguard of this eastern tribe continued its advance, right up to our Volga, without changing its religion, remaining with Judaism. The greatly enriched and lazy parts of the tribe, having become kings and shahs, remained with Islam. That is why it turned out that the East was far ahead of the West in terms of science. The new kings of Islam, accustomed to much intellectual work, could not stop, and directed their efforts to pure science: astronomy, mathematics, and the arts. By the way, algebra in translation is nothing other than the "science of immigrants”.

And one more remark. Islam and Judaism are very close to each other, if you do not pay attention to purely religious issues, but focus on the vital issues of the peoples who profess these religions. Family, there is nothing closer to the common people. So it is believed that polygamy is purely Muslim, while the Judeans have monogamy. This comes from the historian Josephus Flavius, a Jew of "Greek" origin. But monogamy among Jews was established only in 1030, according to Morozov, 400 years after the "emergence" of Islam. And one more fact. Even today, the divorce of a married couple cannot be initiated by a woman among Jews, but a man can do it at any second. But in Islam, a man can simply go out into the street and shout "tallah" three times - I'm getting a divorce, and from that moment he becomes single. And the fact that "Flavius" is lying is also proven quite simply (M.M. Postnikov "Critical Study of the History of the Ancient World", Vol. 1, p. 76): "The works of Josephus Flavius ("The Judean War", "Judean Antiquities", "Life",

"Against Apion") were initially published in 1470 in Latin and only later in 1544 (74 years later! - note - mine) - in Greek (in which Flavius himself allegedly wrote them)".

But not only a change of religion, but even the slightest changes always leave behind significant traces, which sometimes even become more significant for the world than the original artificial change. And then one of the new foreign kings of the aborigines gave birth to Christ, an undoubtedly living person for me, who later, however, greatly multiplied in the consciousness of people. And from this it turned out that when Islam was created, Christianity was created almost simultaneously, and not in Palestine at all, but somewhere in Iran or its environs. This is my opinion.

Now I will move on to some scattered information, gleaned by me from various sources, which, due to my own oversight, were without authors. I will still put quotes in quotation marks, it will be more reliable, although a little embarrassing.

"A she-wolf with babies in Rome is on a medal, and in Central Asia - on a wall in the form of a fresco. Where is older? Moreover, in the "History of the Tang Dynasty" there is a legend that the Turkic tribe of Tukuesians, whose ancestors lived near the "Western Sea" (Aral or Caspian), descended from a she-wolf. Each of the 10 boys of the she-wolf is a special clan. In memory of his origin, one of the descendants of the she-wolf, the sovereign of Ashina, hung a banner with a wolf's head over the entrance to his tent".

What can be extracted from this quote? Firstly, that according to the official history, Cosimo de' Medici allegedly bought the Byzantine manuscripts from Mohammed II, he "bought" the manuscripts, but the fresco remained. And, as I think, he simply conquered them. It is not for nothing that the authors of the "new chronology" Nosovsky and Fomenko quite clearly prove that Mohammed II conquered Byzantium not from the depths of Asia Minor, but from Europe, and, I think, by the Medici, and not Mohammed at all. And the extracts from these Byzantine manuscripts concerning the she-wolf immediately ended up in the history of "ancient Rome". And the "Roman" history was written in the Renaissance, which the Medici began after he organized the Ferrara-Florence Church Council. By the way, having arrived in Rome at that time, some famous Frenchman found nothing there – they had not yet managed to build either the Colosseum or other Roman "antiquities". Secondly, only ten of the 13 tribes of Israel remained. We know that according to the official version, only the thirteenth column of Judeans disappeared without a trace. However, Solzhenitsyn, through Brotzkus, in his latest sensational book (p. 14) assures that ten tribes of Israel "disappeared". I think that it was precisely from these ten tribes that some were assimilated in the East as Muslims, as I wrote above. Where did the other two go? Thirdly, the "Tukyues of the Western Sea" are probably the Khazars, whose history I examined in sufficient detail in my book on a new basis and by necessity. For from the place of the events described (Central Asia), the Aral and Caspian Seas are to the west. Here, I mean the time, we must also include "Sovereign Ashina, who hung out the banner with the wolf's head", that is, the Chechen professional robbers of salt merchants, moving from the Volga to the Black Sea. Especially since among them today there is a considerable layer of Mountain Jews, to which, it seems, Dudayev belonged. All this is set out in my book.

But in the book I did not consider what kind of Christians the Khazars had, since the Khazars themselves practiced three religions at the same time: Islam, Christianity, and Muslimism. The time has come to do this. I will not consider the Islamic and Judean factors among the Khazars here. Those who wish can look at the book "The Mysterious Russian Soul against the Background of World Jewish History". But I will briefly repeat one thing. Even today there is no table salt on the entire Pacific coast. The oldest and easiest salt deposits

for extraction are lakes Elton and Baskunchak. Elton and Baskunchak are between the Caspian and Aral Seas. Baskunchak is 70 km from the Volga to the east, 105 km to the south of Elton. Length and width 20 x 10 km, area 110 square kilometers, water level 18 m below the ocean, depth 40 cm. To the south of it are salt domes. In the West, except for ancient Armenia and Iran, as well as Alexandria, there was no salt anywhere in those days. Therefore, I believe that there was no ancient Great Silk Road, but there were two salt routes from the aforementioned lakes: to the east all the way to Korea through Balkhash; and to the west through the mouth of the Volga, the Northern Caucasus to the Black Sea, and along it to Constantinople and further to the west. That is why the Khazar Khaganate with three parallel religions settled here, south of the aforementioned lakes: Judaism, Islam and Christianity. By the way, in the Khazar Khaganate there was a cult of salt, they even made mirrors from it. More details about this can be found in Pavic's book "The Khazar Dictionary".

I will start with the fact that Catholic Christianity, created by the banker Cosimo Medici, had nothing to do with the Christianity of the Khazars, since Medici lived in the 15th century, about 500 years later than the Khazar Khaganate. There, in the Khazar Khaganate, was Orthodox Christianity, which also has nothing to do with our Russian Orthodoxy. Christian Orthodox faith was created in Syria. Very little is known about it. I found the most complete information about Orthodox faith in the book "Marcus Aurelius and the End of the Ancient World" by the Frenchman Ernest Renan, but there is such nonsense written about it that you could go crazy. He called it Eastern syncretism. Details in my book.

Before dwelling on Christianity in more detail in connection with its spread in Rus", it must be said that it is not for nothing that the Orthodox Judeans of Moses' army still sacredly honor its laws in the West. But in the East, the Judean traders, having assimilated with the local nobility, and having created Islam as I just described, disappeared from the consciousness of their descendants. Now these Jews are forgotten and are not considered the creators of the ancient Eastern culture, period.

The Orthodox faith itself seemed to have dissolved over the centuries, excluding Greece, but its branch called the Nestorians made a lot of noise in the world, especially in Central Asia, Rus", and even China and India. It was the Nestorian presbyter-king John who came to Central Asia from Syria. There is practically nothing about him in Western sources either, just rumors that he created the largest ancient empire all the way to China. It turns out that he united secular and spiritual power in one hand.

Some light is shed on this dark kingdom by an engraved dish found near Perm, in the village of Grigorovskoye. Here is how it is described in the book, for the ignorance of the author of which I have already apologized: "... the absence of the Mother of God in the Ascension scene is unusual for Orthodox iconography, but is consistent with the central point of the Nestorian heresy. They considered Mary not the mother of God, but only the mother of Christ as a man, that is, before his Ascension. The cross and the instruments of the Savior's suffering are also missing. But in the center of the dish there is a cross with the ends in the form of expanding circles, like in Orthodox ones. The Nestorian affiliation of the dish is confirmed by the inscriptions in the official language of the Nestorians, in which the liturgy was held, it was **Syrian**. At the same time, paleographic analysis of the inscriptions showed the lack of **strong skills in Syrian** writing on the part of the master. Rubruk (the quote within the quote – mine): "Chinese Nestorians pronounce their service and have sacred books in **Syriac**, which they do not know, hence they sing, like our monks, who are completely illiterate". The compositions on the dish are based on the **Syro-Palestinian** iconography of those gospel events that were considered by the church to be the most revered. They were most often depicted on the cult objects of pilgrims to the "**holy land**": ampoules for storing oil and holy

water, bronze censers and caskets, rings, bracelets and amulets. From Syria and **Palestine** these modest souvenirs of pilgrims spread throughout the Christian world. They are found in Egypt and Italy, Crimea and Transcaucasia. **Liturgical utensils of the "holy land" also reached the Nestorian monasteries of Central Asia**. In Urgut near Samarkand a **Syrian** bronze censer with episodes from the New Testament was discovered, in Penjikent a **Syrian** glass vessel was found. The reverent attitude towards **Palestinian** relics was preserved in the East of Asia throughout the Middle Ages".

I will interrupt the quote for a minute, I have highlighted a few words here so that you will pay attention to them. The fact is that the author unobtrusively nudges us somewhere to the side, more precisely, to Palestine, although he has no grounds for this. It is firmly established that the Orthodox faith is an invention of Syria, but suddenly "Syro-Palestinian iconography" creeps in, which did not exist in nature, but was simply Syrian. Then immediately follows a reminder about pilgrims and the "**holy land**", which, as is known, is located not in Syria, but in Palestine, and as if reorienting us from Syria to Palestine: "liturgical utensils of the "holy land" were delivered to the Nestorian monasteries of Central Asia". This is already a statement - it was delivered, although further the author directly contradicts himself, because in both Penjikent and Urgut, it was not Palestinian, but specifically Syrian censers and "vessels" that were found. And here again, about the "reverent attitude towards Palestinian relics". That is, it is clear that we are being "pushed" into Palestine, when we have nothing to do there.

The author feels that his logic is not all right, so he pulls us further, already by the ears: "Syrian masters worked **beyond the borders of their country**, spreading the technical methods and style created in the Syro-Palestinian art. It is possible that the prototype of the dish from Grigorovsky was made in the circles of the Nestorians of Iran, where entire corporations of Syrian craftsmen were engaged in artistic metalworking. Hence the noticeable influence of Sassanid toreutics: the conventional transfer of Golgotha in the spirit of the Sassanid "rocks", the proximity of angels in the plot of "Ascension" to the Zoroastrian winged geniuses - patrons of the shahanshahs, etc. The crossing and interaction of various artistic principles in one work is evidence of the complexity of the historical and spiritual life of the era. In Semirechye, where the West and East of Asia met and where large trading cities lay on the great caravan route, favorable soil was created for the interpenetration of elements of dissimilar cultures. The sedentary Sogdian-Turkic population with its cultural syncretism - this is the environment from which the Nestorian dish came".

It turns out to be complete nonsense. As is known, Syria (Damascus) and Iran are the originators of the best iron (steel) in the world, so who knows blacksmithing and minting more than Iranians and Pakistanis? And why the hell did they (sorry) need to export metalworkers? Yes, and even whole corporations? I think, in order to first steal minters to Syria, and from there it is not far to Palestine. After all, the author himself speaks of "Sasanian toreutics", "Zoroastrian winged geniuses - patrons of the shahs", who are nothing more than Muslim angels. And then comes the "crossing and interaction of various artistic principles", which does not say anything specific. Wouldn't it be better to listen to my hypothesis and accept that Orthodox faith was born not in Syria and, even more so, in Palestine, but specifically in Iran, generally on the shores of the Persian Gulf, where a trading tribe exchanged its Judaism for Islam, and then spread to Central Asia all the way to China. And not only there. This is supported by the fact that when any religion is revised, as happened in Eastern Judaism (see above), which turned into Islam, a general split occurs and a bunch of sects arise that were not at all foreseen by the original plan of the reformers. That is why I said above that the descendants of Moses, the Western Judeans, did the right thing by not revising a single letter in their

books to this day. There are such a large pile of examples of this that I don't even want to dwell on them, everyone knows about it.

V.P. Darkevich (“Argonauts of the Middle Ages”, “Science”, Moscow, 1976) writes: “Trade with the western Urals (Kama, Belaya, Vyatka, Perm, Ufa) went through Volga Bulgaria, a huge fur market on the middle section of the Volga highway. The steppe route from Khorezm east of the Volga through the deserted rocky plateau of Ustyurt, the “gate of the peoples”, had already opened. The overland journey from Bulgaria to Khorezm lasted three months. On Ustyurt, along the roads to the Lower Volga, they built caravanserais with wells, reliably protected from flying sand, border fortresses, and watchtowers at a distance of a day’s march (20 – 30 kilometers). But even enterprising Arab merchants preferred not to travel further than Bulgar, and exaggerated rumors about the dangers awaiting travelers in the "Land of Darkness" scared them off. Further along the Kama, the Bulgars themselves conducted trade. They brought only sabres from the Arabs, and the Arabs had crazy profits. <…> And they bring goods with them, and the merchant puts his property separately, and makes a sign on it, and leaves; then after this they return and find the goods that are needed in their country. And each person finds something of those things near his goods; if he agrees, then he takes it, and if not, he takes his things and leaves others, and there is no deception. And they do not know who those are from whom they buy these goods…"

Firstly, this quote once again confirms what I said above, but which is completely unnoticeable to modern people. Nations do not like to trade, they are embarrassed by trade, and if it is impossible to avoid, then they surround it with all sorts of embarrassing tricks, like, we do not trade, God forbid, we just give each other gifts. And honesty has nothing to do with it, it’s just that you can’t cheat twice. Secondly, the author even excitedly informs us that “the steppe route has already opened up…”, not knowing or not wanting to know that this steppe route is a real God’s punishment compared to the water route, the Volga route. However, the author himself lists the unimaginable absurdity of this route. There are wells, I will add, with incredibly salty water. And “flying” sand, and fortresses, and watchtowers, and in general three months of travel instead of three days of sailing along the Volga. The author just doesn’t explain why all this is necessary. I’ll have to explain it myself.

But first, another quote from the same place: “Ibn Fordandbeh gave the route of Jewish merchants who traveled “from east to west and from west to east”. Barcelona – Tudela – Narbonne – Lyon – Verdun – Mainz – Rogensburg, then along the Danube through Hungary and Galich or through Prague, Krakow and Vladimir-Volynsky – to Kyiv. From Kyiv, bypassing the nomadic steppes of the Black Sea region, they went to Volga Bulgaria, went down the Volga – “the main road of silver” – and sailed along the Caucasian and Persian coast of the Caspian. From Rey they penetrated deep into the Asian continent, bypassing Balkh and Sogdiana. If desired, from this city one could return to the west through Baghdad and the Eastern Mediterranean”.

I have cited this quote for the sole purpose of asking you: if the “dry” route parallel to the Volga “from Bulgaria to Khorezm” required three months, then how many years would it take to get there from Barcelona? But there was a route from the Volga, from where it almost merges with the Don, to Kyiv, and I discovered it quite by accident, while researching the word “Samaria”, which in Hebrew means “guard”. There are too many “samarias” and “samaras” on maps of the ancient world that have survived to this day, from Samarkand to Samara, the left tributary of the Volga with the city of Samara and Samara, the left tributary of the Dnieper, which originates from the Donetsk Ridge. The Northern Donets flows from there, flowing into the Don near where the latter approaches the Volga. Although this Samara and the Northern

Donets are fed by snow, that is, they practically dry up in the summer, but the riverbed remains. And in Russia there were never any roads, they used riverbeds, sometimes afloat, sometimes on foot along the shore, sometimes dragged from river to river.

But this route could not be an equivalent replacement for the sea route to Barcelona along the Black and Mediterranean Seas. Rather, it was a transit of salt through Kyiv and Poland to Northern Europe. Later, when a lot of underground salt was found in Poland, it practically ceased to exist, supplying salt only to Kyiv. Remember the famous chumaks, who allegedly carried salt from the Black Sea? As if it could not be brought along the Dnieper. And by the time excellent salt was found in Belarus, this route was completely abandoned, and today there is not even a road, not to mention a railway.

There was certainly a route along the Volga, it is easier to float than to walk off-road. What did they carry there? Note that one good wooden boat, this is not an Ethiopian papyrus, can carry so many sables that all the Persian princesses could not carry the sables, leaving only one sabre instead. The author himself writes that selling sabres was extremely profitable. I wrote about this in my book about silk carried along the Silk Road from China to Europe, although instead of one boat I calculated that three camels would be enough. Ordinary people did not go around in silks and sables, even today it is expensive.

In addition to the information just given, I conducted research on table salt at the dawn of time, and it turned out that, except for Elton and Baskunchak, salt was not available anywhere at that time, and in Byzantium, they even paid the salaries of the military and officials with salt. Imagine, even today 70 percent of the salt in our country is mined there, the reserves have not run out, as you can see. They are replenished automatically every year. Without human participation. I have already written that the entire Far East, with its abundance of fish that needs to be salted, or else it will spoil, has no salt reserves. True, in some places it is evaporated from sea water, but it turns out as tasteless as raw potatoes compared to a steak. There I also explained why the Chinese are teased: "Hodya, do you need salt?" And the Koreans today still eat half-rotten fish, saving salt out of habit. Therefore, I came to the conclusion that salt was transported to the west and east along the "silk" road. Salt was also transported along the Volga from its middle reaches, from where the "seasonal" Yeruslan River flows, flowing past the aforementioned salt lakes, and to the Caspian Sea. In addition, Russian slaves were transported for sale from the upper reaches of the Volga; the "Persians" had an acute shortage of women. The Persian Jew Ibn Fadlan writes about this directly. This is how the dish that I devoted so much space to above came to Perm. Straight from Persia. The native liked it, since the "Persian" merchant no longer had any sabers, he "gave them away".

The Khazar Khaganate owned salt, and it was they who built the above-mentioned “watchtowers and fortresses” so that savvy people would not bypass their customs in Akhtuba, in the area of today’s Astrakhan, but not in it itself, since it was moved from the ancient site by one of the Romanovs. And there was no road there across the lifeless steppe from north to south. I have already said that I have details about this Khaganate in my book.

Now I will move on to Russian Orthodoxy, because I am already a little tired of Jewish traders. I will start with the Horde, which according to official history is Tatar-Mongol, and it was located where the Khazar Khaganate once was, even the capital is the same, only with a different name, that is, at the mouth of the Volga. Besides, you all remember that the Khaganate somehow imperceptibly dissolved in space and time, supposedly even before the arrival of the Tatar-Mongols from Mongolia. At the same time, these same

Mongol-Tatars oppressed us, Russians, very much, but extremely looked after our Orthodox churches, in fact, supported them at their own expense.

As soon as they conquered us, they immediately went to their Astrakhan or whatever they called it, Sarai, I think, and never appeared in Rus' again. Our dukes, one after another, went there themselves, brought tribute, and brought back a label for the continuation of their rule. Some historians even write that this “invasion” of us was a great blessing for us (see my book). Most other historians claim that because of these Tatar-Mongols, we fell very far behind the West, so far behind that even today we still cannot catch up with the West. Our dukes lived so amicably with their conquerors that they intermarried with them up and down, but for some reason they paid tribute. But when Kalita had saved up money, and his heirs had freed themselves from the "yoke", and then, having conquered, united all of Muscovite Rus' into one, from the Urals to Poland, and from the Black Sea steppes to the White Sea, then the Crimean Tatars began to take Russian young ladies, children and men captive, a hundred thousand people at a time.

Not believing all this nonsense, I read a few books and thought about it and decided that there were no Tatar-Mongols or Mongol-Tatars. It was just that the Khazar Khaganate, consisting of Cossack robbers of all bloodlines (more details in the book) bought slaves from our dukes for cheap, and the slaves were you and me, including the Ugrians, Finns and generally anyone who came to hand. In exchange for slaves, they introduced us to the Orthodox faith, which was supposedly Syrian, but in fact Persian and generally "Nestorianism". Just look, the founder of Nestorianism Nestorius, supposedly from Byzantium. But the name Nestorius, according to this very Byzantine tradition, is the son or follower of Nestor. Just like Julian is the son or disciple of Julius, Valentinian is Valentinian, and Valentin himself is Valens, and so on. Nestor turned out to be a Kievan and even "participated" in writing the "Tale of Bygone Years", but when, where he was born, and where he died is unknown. Information about Nestorius is carbon copies, that is, none. The "works" of Nestorius were published only in the 20th century, from which it turned out that there are no differences between Orthodoxy and Nestorianism, that is, Orthodox faith. And on that dish that was found near Perm, and on which, God knows why, the Virgin Mary was not considered a goddess, it was left without the comments I just cited above. They were sort of cancelled (Great Soviet Encyclopedia).

On the ancient coats of arms of the cities of Tiflis (now Orthodox Tbilisi), Kostroma, Yuryev, Zenkov (Poltava), and so on, everywhere the Christian cross is adjacent to the Muslim crescent. On the old Orthodox church near the Rossiya Hotel in Moscow - the same thing: the lower third crossbar of the cross is a crescent. But the Semirechensk region (now Alma-Ata) and the Akmola region (now Astana) - on the coats of arms there are crescents without crosses, in their pure form, so to speak. And the Khazars generally professed three religions at once. What does all this mean? It means that Nestorianism, which arose in Central Asia, more precisely in Persia (Iran), split off from Judaism, had not yet split into Christianity and Islam, because it used both the Muslim and Christian main attribute. It is also the Christian faith, which arose long before Cosimo de Medici decided to create Catholicism. And it was brought to Holy Rus' by the Khazars, a significant part of whom were Cossack robbers. That is why the "monoglo-Tatars" respected our "holy faith" beyond measure. How can they not respect it, if they themselves belong to it.

By this time, Islam had grown stronger and had begun to bud itself, but already there, in Central Asia and the Middle East. And we remained with the Orthodox faith, which is by no means the Orthodoxy of today. Meanwhile, the demand on the Volga for our slaves had subsided, the female class had been restored (details in the book), salt was found everywhere or they learned to get it more pure from sea water, and the Khazar Khaganate dissolved, no one even noticed how. The Khazar Jews partly went to Chechnya, to the

Caucasus in general, partly to Kyiv, and mainly to Rus' and Poland, to make vodka for the people (see Solzhenitsyn's "Two Hundred Years Together"). It is about this one of the routes, the smallest, of Jewish migration that the above-mentioned Ibn-Fordnandbeh writes, and not at all about the Jewish trade route along which they scurried back and forth. Like on an electric train.

I will dwell in a little more detail on the Volga trade, which is also the economic and political conquest of the Yaroslavl-Suzdal Rus, also Vladimir, at that time Muscovite Rus did not exist yet. The Khazar Khaganate, through the efforts of the Jews, turned into a state structure, but its components were too heterogeneous. Irregular warriors, these were mainly Cossack robbers, free people: they robbed, drank away and went to rob again. It was practically impossible to use them as a regular military force, they were painfully unreliable. But they could be set against each other, as smart people do today with criminal groups. The main profit of the Jewish authorities from them was that they did not know the true price of what they stole. Yes, it is still so today, fences of stolen goods give robbers barely a tenth of the true price. These guys do not need any religion, except in rare moments of remorse. Their national composition was, as it is today, very diverse, they got along well. It is not for nothing that much later, on the Don, Russian and Tatar Cossack villages peacefully coexisted side by side. Historical fact.

There were also regular warriors, mostly of pure ethnic composition: future Kalmyks, Tatars, courageous and stubborn, as they say today, warriors. They needed an ideology to direct them where they needed to go. Islam suited them very well: don't get drunk, everything is predetermined by Allah, so go where you are ordered. This was a good army, which for that reason was paid little, and when necessary (read Pavic). Among these Khazar troops there were also uncontrollable ones, living like a cat: on their own. These were the Chechens and their neighbors. There was no way to deal with them, so some of the Jews simply infiltrated them and did their business there, trading, deceiving, exchanging, their religion arose much later, when Russia began to try to "annex" them.

The third component of the Khazar Khaganate were Jews of the Judaic persuasion, who had gone ahead from Iran and did not even know that Islam and Christian orthodox faith were already flourishing there. Why did this happen? Because it is impossible to trade, seeping through peoples, without Judaism (see my book and other articles). The main thing is that as soon as there are too many Jews among any people, they begin to compete fiercely with each other, pushing the less intelligent and successful ones to the periphery, to other peoples. So they flowed along the Volga from Kazan to Nizhny Novgorod, Yaroslavl, Kostroma. Here reigned the ushkuiniks, robbers, but not the Cossacks, who robbed merchants, but not only Novgorod ones, but also English ones, who appeared from the White Sea, the Northern Dvina, Sukhona. They also sold Russian slaves to traders. Because they had nothing else to sell. Sables were not found here in large numbers, it was too hot for them. The Shuiskys and Romanovs later emerged from these ushkuiniks. This was a period when Venice had not yet thought about building its palaces and temples on piles of Russian larch, but on the eve of this.

A fool would be the one who would give away his secrets to everyone for free, on which he earns good money. The main secret of the Jews was Judaism. I will repeat its basis once again, although I have already done this in my works many times. Love only your god Yahweh and strictly observe everything that he requires from you personally for yourself, beloved. This brings the community closer together. That's it, there are no more prohibitions. You can do whatever you please in communication with your own kind, but know that you personally bear responsibility, do not appeal to Yahweh. Your internal affairs do not interest him at all. Therefore, the Jews, without thinking, began to introduce Islam in Rus", after all, it is a very good

thing - everything is predetermined and do not twitch. But they quickly noticed that you can't go against the age-old favorite national drink - mead. This is also evident from the notes of Ib-Fadlan. But to bring grape wines from Persia to the people would be more expensive than mead, and the Jews did not know how to make mead. And they could not wedge themselves into this business - you have to crawl through the taiga and take honey from wild bees, and then you also have to ferment it skillfully, there were many poisonings without them. Then they quickly came up with vodka, terribly cheap and too angry, as they say. I have details in other works.

On this basis, two tendencies began to flourish: Orthodox faith, an exact copy of Nestorianism, with a significant admixture of Islam, in the part not related to vodka, and the enslavement of free farmers on the basis of "free" booze, supposedly, you'll give it back later. And here the dish from Grigorovsky came in handy. I'm even ready to admit that it was specially brought along with the sabres at the time, but not for sale, but as a pure gift.

I have already said that salt was found everywhere, and the demand for Russian slaves disappeared on the Volga, and the rest of the trade no longer met the needs of the growing tribe of traders. Moreover, the population was extremely poor, there was nothing here except marten skins and bast shoes. You can't take bast shoes for export. Therefore, the traders lived only on vodka and at its expense took the last from the population. In general, the Jews in the upper reaches of the Volga pupated, and even assimilated in some way with the Russians, dissolving in it so that the innkeepers also began to be considered Russians. I will note that some of the ushkuiniks, the richer ones, also wanted to "live beautifully", like today's new Russians, the Jews quickly provided them with this opportunity and at the same time, wedged themselves between them. They hired builders and erected, without touching the bricks themselves, everything that is still visible today in the Upper Volga cities. Nothing remains of the Orthodox faith of those times now, except for the aforementioned dish; everything was burned and destroyed first by the "Varangians", paving the way from Smolensk to Kostroma for larch and bringing Catholicism with them, and the Romanovs finished it off, already moving from Catholicism to Orthodoxy, which, I repeat, should not be confused with Orthodox faith.

The Lower Volga, that is, the Khazars, completely withered away without trade in salt, which no one needs now. And their mobile part, the trading tribe, fled in all four directions, while the aborigines remained in place, as they should. The route "from the Varangians to the Greeks", which I call the route "from Venice to Kostroma", I have already described several times in my previous works. Here I will only say that for some time on the Upper Volga, Catholicism and Orthodox faith coexisted, permeating each other, which is evident at least from the fact that Russian patriarchs changed every now and then in the strangest way, which I also talked about in my other works. It is time to move on to the Don River.

The lower and middle reaches of the Don, where it comes closest to the Volga, were part of the Khazar Khaganate, but were of secondary importance. Mostly Russian bandits were bandits there, starting with Nightingale the Robber and Ilya Muromets, although there were also representatives of the Kazan Tatars, as evidenced by the Tatar temporary settlements neighboring the Russians, which only later became stanitsas. There was nothing to trade in particular along the Don; in its upper reaches lived the "eccentric" Chud, "who did not know weapons". The main area of the Don Cossack robbers' trade was the lower reaches of the Don and the Sea of Azov. Here, the transit of salt from the depths of Khazaria, from Baskunchak, alternately appeared and then disappeared. When the future Chechens gained great strength and penetrated far from their mountains to the plain, the route of the salt merchants stopped here and moved from the Volga to the

Don and along it through the Sea of Azov to Kerch and further along the usual route. When the Chechens and other North Caucasian peoples grew weaker, they hid in the mountains and experienced hardships there. I wrote about this in detail in the book I mentioned. The Cossack robbers also lived in strips, sometimes well, sometimes poorly. Jews, of course, also lived there, counted the Cossacks' money, bought up stolen goods, and acted as bankers under the name of money changers. The religion was also incomprehensible, the same as in the upper reaches of the Volga: almost Islam, but you can drink vodka as much as you want. Everything is predetermined by God, but you can also play pranks, steal and rob, and then pray for forgiveness. In general, Nestorianism or Orthodox faith. What other religion should bandits profess? It is still professed today by bandits in crimson jackets and with cell phones in their hands. You go, rob, kill, and then come to church, buy a color TV for the priest, put a five-hundred-ruble note in a mug, and you are as clean as a cucumber, or rather, as a cherub or a child angel. By the way, we had a holiday like the Jews - on Saturday, and we moved it to Sunday later than all other Christians. In general, the bandit income was not that stable on the Don. It is not without reason that Yeruslan Lazarevich, from whom Pushkin copied his Ruslan, was somewhat dismissive of the Podon Horde, representing the Zadonsk, Volga Horde. Of course, slaves were delivered along the Don, those very same unresponsive "eccentrics" to Kafa, now Kerch, but these were, so to speak, one-time, small events, like the sale of hairpins and audio-video cassettes in a supermarket. There was no great demand for slaves in Kafa yet.

As they say, a holy place is abhorred by emptiness. Trade on the Volga has completely died out, but the demand for slaves in Kafa, and therefore on the Don, has sharply increased, just like for oil in the 1970s. And it was precisely for unskilled slaves, if only they had strength and endurance. The Chud were exactly that, and completely unarmed, come and take as many as you need. And there were Chud in the upper reaches of the Don and, especially beyond the Oka to the north, apparently countless. Today, all those Chud in the form of descendants live throughout the Mediterranean, and the remnants are in Finland. Actually, they were not allowed to reproduce much in the Mediterranean, especially the men chained to the oars of the galleys: he rowed and rowed and died from the strain, he was thrown overboard and a new one was put in. Oh, and a lot of such "goods" were needed. But there were also plenty of Chud in the forests from Smolensk to Murom and from the Oka to the future Finland. More about this in my book. In general, the "business" was fantastically profitable, almost no overhead costs, not to mention the cost price, that is, the education of future slaves. They grew like wild mushrooms, come and cut them. They, I repeat, did not even know weapons.

The Don Cossack robbers began to grow fat, and fat, as we know, makes you crazy. It is difficult to create a comfortable life on the Don itself, after all, on the seven winds, from here and there, the robbers themselves came to rob. Either the Zadonsk Horde, or the Chechens, history shows us plenty of examples of roving gangs. They were even on the Nile, in the reeds, the "ancient Greeks" describe them. In general, they decided to create a capital for themselves, far from these "seven winds", where most of the Chud were "mown down". I even think that Kolomna on the northern bank of the Oka was built first, and then Moscow itself, exclusively in wood, because they themselves did not know how to build because of their profession, and the Chud had always made do with wood. They brought the loot to these capitals, hid it, partied and drank away the loot here, and most importantly, they hid themselves when they were not in great strength, but in the form of a "beaten army", that is, solid corpses, as it is said in the tale of Yeruslan Lazarevich. Naturally, the main robber of the Ilya Muromets type commanded in Moscow, whom all the other robbers feared like fire or, as the “Solntsevsky” nowadays. Moscow burned every two weeks, either out of

drunkenness, or out of anger, or because of the inability to build, when solid wooden buildings stretched for a mile. In general, whoever was the duke on the Don was also the duke in Moscow. By the way, the Pechenegs, who are the same Khazars as Constantinople, Tsargrad and Istanbul are one and the same city, had in their hierarchical vocabulary both dukes and grand dukes, just as the Persians had shahs and shahs-in-shahs. Therefore, it is not surprising that these same characters appeared in Muscovy, as, incidentally, in Vladimir-Suzdal Rus on the Volga.

Now I must quote from myself (from the book): “It is time to move on to the foundation of the Moscow principality. But first, let us look at ancient Volok Lamsky, now Volokolamsk on the Lama River, which is associated today only with the 28 Panfilov heroes, but not with the formation of the Moscow principality. Even officially, Volok Lamsky (1135) is older than Moscow (1147). Remember also that the Moscow dukes traveled to this Lamsky Portage from their Moscow almost every month. What did they need there? And why does the word portage come from the word portochit, to drag boats by dry land? Nowadays, how do they get from the Moscow River to the upper Volga? Along the Moscow Canal. But you can also not go along the canal, but along the tributaries of the Moscow River to the Lama and there drag the boat a little bit into it and sail along the Lama to present-day Rybinsk, and get to the Volga. From here it is easy to get to Tver along the Volga, and Tver is also older than Moscow. Along the Moscow River itself, if you sail not up but down, you get to the Oka near Kolomna, and then it is a stone’s throw to Ryazan, which is also older than Moscow (1095). Moreover, Ryazan owned the sources of the Don near Tula. But that’s not all. From the Lama tributary you can get to the Ruza River, and from the Ruza to the sources of the Dnieper no more than 4-5 kilometers. And a little lower, where the Dnieper has already taken the form of a real river, there is Smolensk, founded in 862, before Christianity. Can you imagine what a strategic place this is? Along the Osetr River, which flows into the Oka, you can get to the ancient city of Venev, located on the watershed of the Don basin, from which the Upa River is not far away. Volokolamsk, thus, connects into a single whole the entire southern water system of Eastern Europe: the Dnieper, the Don and the Volga. And this strategic point, which is more important for Russia than Constantinople on the Bosphorus, belongs to no one. Imagine, no one.

Moscow "annexed" the Tver Principality only in 1485, after a complete victory over the "Tatars". Moscow "annexed" the Ryazan Principality only in 1521, after more than four hundred years of wars between them. Moscow "annexed" Yaroslavl in 1463, the Tula Principality in 1521, Novgorod, founded in 859, in 1478. Moscow "annexed" Smolensk in 1514. But Smolensk is not some Yaroslavl. It stands in the way of the forest "strategic interests" of the West. It had to be won back from Lithuania in 1514, and then again, and this time from Poland in 1654. The most recent "annexation" took place in 1521 (Ryazan and Tula, Smolensk had already been ours since 1514). Thus, the strong Muscovite state in 1521 completely cut off the Black Sea steppes with its continuous powerful border, and the Tatar "yoke" was finished even earlier, in 1480, just after the "annexation" of Yaroslavl in 1463.

**AND IDIOCY ARRIVED**. Individual weak states-principalities during the "heyday" of the Tatar yoke did not have as many "raids" from the "Crimean Tatars" to capture slaves as the strong united Muscovite kingdom began to have from the "Tatars" defeated more than 150 years ago? I quote from Klyuchevsky: “**At the beginning of the 16th century, the southern steppe lying between the Muscovite state and Crimea began soon after Old Ryazan on the Oka and after Yelets on the Bystraya Sosna, a tributary of the Don”. I’ll skip a bit further: “Prisoners flowed into Crimea in such numbers that one Jewish money changer, according to Mikhalon’s story, sitting at the only gate of Perekopia that led to Crimea, and seeing the endless strings of**

**prisoners brought there from Poland, Lithuania and Muscovy, asked Mikhalon whether there were still people in those countries or whether there was no one left**". I didn't single out Poland and Lithuania, see above.

1521, the year the last neighboring principality was annexed to Moscow, wasn't it the beginning of the 16th century? Undoubtedly, the beginning. What's the matter? Here's the matter. In the West, they found table salt in Germany and Poland, learned to evaporate sea water better, not so bitter, so Lakes Elton and Baskunchak lost their significance, the Great Passage Yard almost ceased to function, the Khazars dissolved in space, like salt in water, without a trace. The demand for Volga slaves fell sharply. But it increased at the mouth of the Don, in Crimea and in the lower reaches of the Dnieper. The ancient world began to be "built" in full swing. Therefore, all the above-mentioned groups of peers: Yaroslavl, Kazan, Ryazan and others, significantly older than Moscow, gradually fell into decline. There was no sale of slaves here. The Yaik Cossack robbers, whom I sent to Yaik by mistake (they were hanging around in the lower reaches of the Volga until that day), have only now moved to Yaik for permanent residence and taken up honest work: they began to catch sturgeons (read about their fishing, there is information and rules for catching). The demand for sturgeons was huge, the Yaik River was full of sturgeons, no one interfered. Today these Cossacks are considered the most honest.

The slave-trading dukes who sold their people into slavery thought about it and moved towards Volok Lamsky, which is why they "conquered" Yaroslavl first. And there was no need to conquer it, it belonged to them anyway. Then they moved a little from Volok and founded "beautiful Moscow" at the sources of three great rivers of Eastern Europe". End of quote.

I brought it up because, due to a lack of erudition, I mentioned Volok Lamsky prematurely, which I should not have done. Much water will flow under the bridge before Moscow needs it. I will dwell on wooden Moscow with a grand duke in the Pecheneg manner and living only on the slave trade. These dukes lived as if with their legs spread out. And you have to be on the Don, otherwise your bandit skills will disappear, and the new generation, as they say today, will rise up high. And you can't leave Moscow for long, the whole "common fund" is hidden here, it's a pity to part with it. This "disarray" arose because the inheritance of the title of prince was essentially gangster-like, passing from the "boss" to the boss' right-hand man, most often to his brother, but sometimes simply to a "named" brother. I wrote about this in detail in my book, here are the theses. Therefore, the bandit "grand duke" was never calm, always on edge, as he is today. And even the scrupulous Karamzin began to write them down in bulk: "Svyatoslav Vsevolodovich, Andrei Yaroslavich, Alexander Nevsky - successively 1247-1263", or "Georgy Danilovich, Dmitry and Alexander Mikhailovich - one after another 1319-1328". The princes were simply torn between Moscow and the Don. But the royal life behind the wooden palisade with which their Kremlin was fenced corrupts and weakens the will. And here you go, elections on the Don, because only there they elected the ataman, according to his deeds, as they say. And even Ivan Kalita was "elected" there, "among the Tatars". And finally, one dared, said that he would not go to any elections, and his son would reign after him. This was, as you understand, the Grand Duke Dmitry, nicknamed, as it should be, Donskoy. He was from the Don, and Ilya, who is Muromets, was one of the "founders", since "mur" in Jewish means to build, to found. Whether a gang or a city.

And then the Battle of Kulikovo followed, which took place in Moscow, on Kulishki, according to the irrefutable data of Nosovsky and Fomenko. That is, the "brotherhood" on the Don was very offended by such an overthrow of their "concepts" and arrived in Moscow for Kulishki in full force under the pseudonym

of "Tatars" headed by a "field bandit", deputy for "concepts" of Donskoy himself. The aforementioned new chroniclers, however, do not talk about this. But Donskoy defeated them, and his son Vasily Dmitrievich began to reign, the "disarray" ceased once and for all. However, for another hundred years the Cossack robbers tried to restore the old order of bandit inheritance of the Moscow throne, but to no avail. The royal grace began in Muscovite Rus'.

The Jews quickly moved to the new capital of robbers and began their age-old duties: to trade, deceive, enslave, accumulate capital, act on the authorities not directly, but indirectly. Read Solzhenitsyn's latest book, everything is explained there clearly. Except for one thing, that Jews did not first come to us from Poland, although their number increased from there, but from the Khazar Khaganate, where they peacefully coexisted with bandits. I just can't say for sure where they invented "Russian" vodka, in Yaroslavl or here in Moscow? In my book I have shown exhaustively that Russians themselves could not have invented vodka, they are not educated enough, and it is a complex process. Yes, and you can quote Solzhenitsyn, even more than one: 1. "And in the southwestern region, by 1872, Jews already leased 89 percent of all distilleries. Since 1863, Jews were allowed to distill in Western and Eastern Siberia (since "the most remarkable specialists in distilling are almost exclusively Jews"), and since 1865, Jewish distillers were allowed to live everywhere". 2. "The 1817 statute on the drinking tax in the Great Russian provinces prohibited Jews from distilling there, however, in 1819 the ban was lifted - until Russian masters improve in distilling". And they also say that vodka is a Russian invention. Even in the 19th century, Russians did not know how to distill vodka, not to mention the 15th century, when vodka first appeared on the scene. Therefore, I would like to remove some of the blame from the Russian nobles, whom I completely accused in my book of getting the people drunk in order to gain power over them, up to and including slavery (serfdom).

So, the 16th century began with a grandiose sale of their people into slavery, and this went almost in parallel, only slightly behind, the unification of Rus' "under the hand" of the great Moscow dukes. The fact that at this time in "Holy Rus'" according to official history there were no Jews at all, although vodka was already officially according to this same history, makes me very wary. Didn't they pull off the same combination here as in Persia, becoming our official rulers, tsars? No longer on the basis of Islam, but on the basis of Orthodox faith - Nestorianism, under which you can drink vodka as much as you want. Under which both the cross and the crescent were in use, and the Virgin Mary was a simple maiden. Moreover, at the same time the so-called "heresy of the Judaizers" appeared, about which information is not so much scanty as vague. And the direct conductor of this heresy was Dmitry Donskoy's great-grandson Ivan III (or rather his wife, the "Byzantine" Sophia Paleologue), who bought New Athos from the Turks in Constantinople. In addition, "he hoped to maintain the favor of influential Crimean Jews: the duke and ruler of the Taman Peninsula Zacharias de Guizolfi and the Crimean Jew Hozi Kokos, close to Khan Mengli-Girey", writes Solzhenitsyn. How, I thought, can one trade with one's people without this heresy, the transport artery itself - the Don - is now in one's own hands, and the trade intermediaries in the final sale of the "goods" in Kafa are not only friends, but also co-religionists. It is only funny to read further that Ivan III, a year before his death, overcame "this heresy", which he had supported for so many years, and "after the Council of 1504, some of the heretics were burned, others were imprisoned, and others fled to Lithuania, "where they formally accepted Judaism", Solzhenitsyn quotes from the Brief Jewish Encyclopedia. However, under Peter I, the vice-chancellor, Baron Pyotr Shafirov, with such a Russian or Tatar surname, was a Jew. And "the priest's son from Ukraine, Pyotr Verevkin, was also a Jew", and he was also False Dmitry I. And False Dmitry II was "a convert from the Jews and served in the retinue of False Dmitry I" (Karamzin). In another place,

Solzhenitsyn writes: “... we find in Karamzin: “the Cossacks surrounding False Dmitry, obviously Zaporozhian, cursed the Russians as Jews”.

But it was False Dmitry who "forcibly" appointed Filaret as the Patriarch of Rus”, whose grandson Alexei Mikhailovich, the second Romanov, abolished Catholicism in Rus' and restored Orthodoxy, no longer the Orthodox faith, but Orthodoxy. It seems to me that it was the Romanovs who returned to the "heresy of the Judaizers", having driven the "Don Rurikovichs" from the throne. But let's take things in order.

The time of expansion to Holy Rus' of the West has arrived. And Catholicism began it, especially since the "route from the Varangians to the Greeks" was actually the "route from Kostroma to Venice" for the delivery of larch on piles (see the book, as well as other works). Gradually, like all Catholics, we began to cross ourselves with two fingers, forgot that the Virgin Mary is only an ordinary mother, but not a Goddess, and began to paint her in portraits. By the way, Catholics did the same, only much later, at the request of the Jews, Catholicism abandoned icons, and earlier it painted them, one hundred percent. With the general triumph of Catholicism in Rus”, excluding Muscovy, many stone churches were built, which was almost never done before, and almost every one of them still has a Catholic cross shining on it, with one crossbar, on which Spartacus' defeated warriors were hung in Rome. On a few churches there are "new Orthodox" crosses, eight-pointed, and as I said above, with the use of a "lying" crescent, because of which the current patriarch has a real scandal with the Muslim community. But all this did not concern Muscovite Rus”, as I have already said. It concerned only the "larch route to Venice" - Kostroma, Yaroslavl, Vologda and further to the Urals, and even beyond the Urals. This route could not do without Jews either, a very constant and profitable trade. And the Venetian Republic was also ruled by Jews, who turned fishing villages on the islands in the famous lagoon into a world trade center. And Cosimo de' Medici himself - the founder of Catholicism (see the book), although from Florence, by the nature of his activities - the world's foremost banker - could not be anything but a Jew.

That's when the ushkuiniks Shuisky and Romanov became worried. The profits from the forest did not end up in their pockets, they all remained with the Jews, and the robbery on the Volga was sheer devastation. They found out about the Moscow profits and went to conquer Muscovy. I have the details in another article "About the Kremlin, the Chetis, the Zaseeks, the first Romanovs, and the Cossack bandits".

It took a long time or a short time, but the Romanovs came to power in Moscow - the Volga robbers, the ushkuiniks, headed by the elected "Poles" Metropolitan Filaret - allegedly the father of the first Romanov, a real idiot who did not actually reign for a single day. But Filaret's grandson Alexei Mikhailovich "The quietest", the father of Peter I, quickly burned every single church book and chronicle and issued new ones in their place, according to which it was necessary to cross oneself immediately and suddenly with three fingers. At the same time, he introduced the most severe serfdom, which was made even more severe by the German Catherine "the Great". Life began to improve in Russia, and soon the world began to fear it, and then simply dread it.

After thinking a little, the Romanovs decided to return to the religion that existed in Muscovite Rus' under the "Khazars", "Rurikovichs" and Cossack robbers. Only now they called it not the Orthodox faith, but Orthodoxy. Well, that seems to be all about religions. Oh, I forgot. In Orthodoxy, the "Holy" Virgin Mary was left out of Catholicism, the people were too used to her. And, naturally, Jesus Christ was born not as a simple man as in Nestorian Orthodox faith, but immediately - God, since Mary became pregnant not from a simple man Joseph, but from the Holy Spirit himself. In this regard, I cannot help but note the following

idiotic feature. Catholics probably cross themselves with two fingers because they don't have one of the Trinity, either the Holy Spirit or the Son, since the "virgin" Mary is not a god. She is just one of a bunch of saints. And this is a remnant of matriarchy, a remnant of the mother goddess Cybele, Aphrodite and others. In Russian Orthodoxy, things are exactly the same. The Mother of God is not a goddess, but merely "most holy", that is, one of hundreds of "saints", but of a slightly higher rank. And this directly says that all of Christianity "came" from "Nestorianism", which considered Mary a simple woman who gave birth to Christ, without focusing our attention on who his father was?

Although the Muslim Koran exclaims: “Oh, Mariam, you have done something unheard of! Oh, sister of Harun (Aaron, brother of Musa-Moses)!” Orthodox faith, so that we would not think anything bad about the relationship between Jesus’ father and Mary, immediately introduced the Holy Spirit into the Trinity. He was probably the one who had to perform marital duties at the birth of Christ, without casting a shadow on God. Otherwise, why would we cross ourselves with three fingers instead of two? Even our teenagers, who have known “about this” firsthand since the seventh grade, laugh at this “joke”.

I forgot to say that galleys soon went out of fashion, a complex and effective system of sails was invented, so the need for slave rowers disappeared. History, as I said, was rewritten, blaming everything on the Crimean Tatars, who are now very proud of this. Alexei Mikhailovich had to, in addition to replacing religion, introduce the most terrible internal slavery to replenish the treasury and further conquer "lands", but I have written about the famous Cathedral Code of 1649 in other works.

At this point I finished this article, but suddenly decided to make some conclusion, or rather, to group it from the above. What would I like to draw the reader's attention to? To the fact that historians to this day, including Solzhenitsyn's latest book "Two Hundred Years Together", consider, excluding dark hints in a tongue twister, that there were no Jews in Ancient Rus' at all. Yes, they were in the Khazars, yes, they had a settlement in Kyiv, yes, they traded on the way from the Volga and Don to Kyiv across the steppe. But in Yaroslavl, Vladimir and Moscow, they were supposedly never found, and in general, their entry here was prohibited before Peter I.

I consider this fact to be deeply erroneous. Firstly, the Khazar Jews could not have disappeared without a trace, like the Khazar Khaganate itself. After all, the other peoples of this Khaganate remained in place and continue to live there today. Yes, some of the Jews settled down, having semi-assimilated among the North Caucasian, Black Sea and Crimean peoples in the form of "Teips", "Greeks" and so on. Yes, an insignificant part of them ended up in the Kyiv settlement at the Golden Gate, having got there from the Azov and Black Sea regions, although, by and large, the overwhelming majority of them appeared there from Northern Italy, from the Venetian Republic, and specifically for the trade in Russian timber. In Poland, as in Germany, the Jews ended up in the traditional way from the Mediterranean on the rights of the Roman Empire, which is actually a Catholic Empire created by the Jew Cosimo Medici. Although some of the Jews there could have come from Muscovy, during the period of the "Judaizing heresy", but they "were not there" in Muscovy, were they?

Secondly, two historical facts, vodka and the slave trade, could not have spontaneously formed in Rus'. For this, the truly Russian dukes were completely illiterate. Moreover, note that the first vodka was made from wheat, which did not exist in Rus' at all, millet grew there mainly, and only then - rye. Wheat began to be cultivated in the Middle and, especially, the Lower Volga region, where there were no Russians themselves. I have already given examples that even in the 19th century, Russians did not know how to

distill vodka, although it is called "Russian", this was done exclusively by Jews. But they "were not there" in Rus", were they? Let's take the slave trade. Yes, Ibn Fadlan, a Persian merchant of Jewish descent, writes that Russian merchants floated Russian young ladies down the Volga for sale. But, again, a Jew would be a fool if he did not take this very profitable trade into his own hands. And there are no fools among Jews, especially in the trade sector, and there never have been. And the "founding" of Moscow? Wasn't this a strategic solution to the trade issue of supplying slaves, which all previous civilizations did not know? (More details in the book, but there is a mistake there, which I corrected above). And hiding this very fact from history, when there were no literate people in Rus' at all, and all history was written by Jews? And in general, where did so many Jews with "originally" Russian surnames come from in Rus'? And finally, in what other religion, in what other people, is there a direct call to "eternally use the services of slaves"? In support of these words, note, if you read Solzhenitsyn, how long and radically unsuccessfully the Russian government tried to forbid Jews from "using the domestic services of Christians". Yes, they will still be sitting up to their ears in filth until they buy the services of a "Christian" cleaning lady.

So, I won't be far from the truth if I say that the Russian state was created by Jews. Especially since by the beginning of the last century, 51 percent of world Jewry lived in Russia. The data is quite official and was cited by Solzhenitsyn, a scrupulous man. But it was not this that made me continue the article, but the recent, terrible collapse of the World Trade Center towers in New York.

In passing, I have repeatedly stopped in my works to think that the "eastern" branch of the Yemeni trading tribe, which I somewhere corrected into "Saudi", heading around Arabia, did not subsequently recognize its blood "branch", which headed west with Moses, when they met on the Bosphorus in Constantinople. It is not for nothing that these branches, each on its own side, still believe that the "branches, tribes" have "disappeared" somewhere. Now I understand why this happened. The Tower of Babel, as you all know, was not completed, the builders stopped understanding each other, they had to abandon this idea, because not a single "language" could do it on its own, and for some reason the builders' languages became different. At one time, I connected this with Islam, which spread to half the world on the basis of Jewish literacy, but then all these parts of the Muslim world decided to have their own language and literacy based on Arabic, not Jewish. So the Muslim world was divided into countries with the same faith. And this did not stop them from even fighting with each other when the rulers wanted it. But be that as it may, the alphabetic script was invented by the Jews, and the Arabic script of the Hebrew letters, as well as the Greek script of the Hebrew letters, does not change anything in principle, but on the contrary, proves that the basis of all religions is Judaism, no matter how much people do not love Judas.

Now I understand this division of languages even more broadly, relating it not only to Muslim countries, but also to Christian ones. But at least the Judeans are not hypocrites. And the Muslim elite, as well as the Christian ones, wrote down moral commandments on paper, which are not even mentioned in the Book of Moses (see my book), but they did not stop fighting and killing for no reason, but on the contrary, they intensified wars, both overt and covert, which have reached the point of universal horror today. And the Jews, the overwhelming majority of whom do not live in Israel, by the way, are not fighting. Israel is fighting because some Jews were simply deceived, having been assigned a "homeland" in Palestine, although they were considering it all over the globe, including Angola and Uganda. Their homeland is the highland plateau on the border of Yemen and Saudi Arabia, where they waited out the Great Flood, and then went down to the sea to trade. And all these "wailing walls" and other things in Jerusalem and in the "promised land" in general were built no more than 200 years ago, by the way, to collect money, as well as for the pilgrimage

to Mecca. Here are the Jewish fools fighting there, where can they go? But 80 percent of Jews are still smarter, and emigrated from Russia straight, but past Israel, to all other countries, mainly to America, which even stopped this "Mamai" invasion.

The "separation of languages" occurred when, on the basis of the Jewish alphabetic script, the national alphabetic scripts of the "Arabs", "Greeks", "Latins", and then all the others, including Russians, were created. And before that, when the "tower" of the first Islamic empire was being built, there was only one written language in the whole world - Jewish, or, if you like, Hebrew (from that very plateau), also Phoenician, Biblical (city of Byblos) and all the others, for which historians and linguists still cannot find a worthy "place of origin". Everyone is weaving some kind of nonsense, like the "Semitic-Hamitic branch" of the "Afro-Asiatic tree of languages". (See my book). But that's just by the way.

Some "lost tribes of Israel" brought Islam to the world with all its varieties, other "tribes" brought Christianity with all its trends, while they themselves remained with Judaism, the most advantageous religion not for the hierarchs, but for the people who profess it. Both Islam and Christianity, on the contrary, are extremely advantageous for the hierarchs, they are the rulers of the people, but not for the people who profess them. Islam, roughly speaking, does not give the common man the opportunity to show any initiative - everything is predetermined, and has long been written down for everyone. And paradise for everyone is the true reward for all the senseless life, which is not worth cherishing, it is not even life, but just a dormant bud, from which real life beyond the threshold of death may or may not grow. Therefore, Islam has very good troops, both overt and secret.

Christianity at its dawn was almost a copy of Islam in this matter, but the Reformation, a true achievement of civilization, spoiled it greatly in the described respect. Human rights, which almost everyone without exception never fully understood, were wedged in here. And it is unlikely that anyone on the street, the first one you come across, will explain their essence without resorting to cliches, which are a cliche - an elastic band with letters, and nothing more. And an incomprehensible thing can be interpreted in such a way that you can only shake your head, or twist your finger at your temple. Or you need to remember the Declaration by heart, which is also unrealistic, bearing in mind the sclerotics and morons, whose lives are increasingly being saved in maternity hospitals.

Both religions under consideration leave a person only to ask God, give me this, give me this, send me this, send me another, bless me for this, save me from this. Just some kind of kindergarten, like under your mother's skirt or at the blackboard, until the grave. But the troops are good, if you believe in any of the gods.

Almost no one knows true Judaism, neither Christians nor Muslims. And it is very simple and universal, understandable to any fool. I have already spoken about this, but I will emphasize it again. Faith and private life are different things, never intersecting anywhere. A Jew is obliged to honor Yahweh and strictly follow all his covenants regarding himself, beloved Yahweh, eat kosher, observe the Sabbath and a few other, completely unburdensome things. This helps people who do not know each other to identify themselves, and if they want, to help each other. But, God forbid, this is not an obligation, and not even a request, just as they say in the movies, "food for thought”. This is the first thing. Secondly, the god Yahweh does not concern himself with a person's private life at all, or with relationships between people in general, do as you know, as you feel and as you want. The god Yahweh does not care about this. For this freedom of choice, this universal and all-round permission, you do not owe anything to anyone, not even to Yahweh. You bear

responsibility only when something stronger on Earth is found that will make you pay: the law, the government, circumstances, and so on. Is there a freer person on Earth than a Judean? I ask you. And I will also ask you: is this religion too complex to understand and remember, for example, about pork?

This simple, universal and easy to remember religion allowed the Judeans to conquer the whole world, yes, the whole world. Now I have two theses. First: Osama bin Laden is undoubtedly a Jew, although he is listed as a Muslim. And if it turns out that he comes from places close to that plateau in Saudi Arabia I mentioned, then he is a Jew squared. This is also indicated by his elongated face of Moses and his whole appearance. Education - too. For other evidence, I direct you to the beginning of the article, where I wrote about the introduction of Jews into the top of power in eastern countries, where they first sailed simply to trade. In our Russian top - too (look at the work of Gerasimov on restoring the appearance of ancient dukes from skulls). Therefore, the leadership of bin Laden's organization should think carefully about their Jewishness. And do not try to kill me, because this will be clear proof that I am right. And if you think carefully, your eyes will be opened to everything that is happening in the world today and you will make the only right decision, as Marxists say: stop all this, because in America today the Jews also rule. Only they were not Muslims. Although, let me quote the Koran once again: “Oh, Mariam (as you understand, the Virgin Mary), you have done an unheard-of deed! O sister of Harun ... (Aron, who else?) (Surah 19/28-29). Or: “Behold, the angels said: Oh, Mariam! Behold, Allah gives you good tidings of a word from Him, whose name is the Messiah Yesa (Jesus in our language), the son of Mariam, glorious in the near and the last world and from those close to Him” (Surah 3/40). What kind of “unheard-of deed” could she have done, from which children are born in nine months? Moreover, she is not only the sister of Aaron, Moses' high priest and brother, but also the sister of Moses (Musa). I will add that my book has a special chapter called "Gods and Incest".

Second thesis. The Western branch of Jews has long understood that it rules the world, including the Muslim world, due to Jewish ingenuity in trade and finance. It has become very impudent, but their religion allows them to do so. But this branch has forgotten that a Jew must still answer to a force that is higher than his power on Earth.

And I am very surprised in this regard, what are they doing in the World Jewish Congress? You have long ago won all your rights, isn't it time to move on to constructive developments? But first, please, find out your blood relatives in the Muslim elite. And talk to them like brothers, frankly, face to face, and not with the help of letters with anthrax. What do the postmen have to do with it, even though they are your common “slaves”. To finish, another quote from M. M. Postnikov (p. 78): “It is believed that the “father of Talmudic Judaism” AKIBA BEN-JOSEPH, who allegedly lived in the 1st-2nd centuries AD, compiled the “Book of Akiba on the Decoration of Letters”, in which he explains the meaning and significance of the graphic elements of Hebrew letters. However, even the most orthodox “Jewish Encyclopedia” is forced to admit that “the Book itself does not give the slightest indication of the time of its compilation”, and reports that its first edition appeared in Mantua only in 1613”. I did not want to draw attention to the "shortening" of the chronology here, although this is very important, but to the prefix "ben", which ben Laden also has. And almost a third of Jews have this prefix, starting with Ben-Gurion, the founder of Israel.

Linguistics

Introduction

In my book "The Mysterious Russian Soul against the Background of World Jewish History" and a number of articles continuing and expanding on the topic of this book, I repeatedly dwelled on both the so-called "Indo-European family of languages" and the "Afro-Asiatic tree of languages". And I came to the conclusion that these "families" and "trees" as they are presented are the height of idiocy. In other words, all of world linguistics is standing on its head, and its legs, which are designed specifically for standing, are dangling in the air completely idle. The head is numb and does not understand anything. This happened because the wrong starting point was chosen as the basis of linguistics - all sorts of conquests and migrations of peoples in their entirety, every single one, whereas trade should be taken as the basis. But not just trade as such, which, supposedly, "arose" in each people-tribe by itself, "starting with simple exchange", but trade as a means of initially simple survival of a specific tribe, called at the dawn of humanity a trading tribe. Then this means of survival turned into a means of unobtrusive, hidden possession of all the other "tribes" on Earth by this trading tribe.

The impossibility of the "emergence" of trade in every nation-tribe is evidenced by the fact that there is no nation, except for the Jews, who would not be embarrassed to trade. Trade, if it cannot be avoided, is covered up by all nations with all sorts of nonsense like "gifts" with the obligatory "reciprocation", and precisely in equal value. And if the gift is not equal, then you can even fight. The fact is that to be a professional trader you need to have a number of properties and qualities, some of which most nations despise, and quite rightly, and some of which they do not consider it necessary to burden themselves with because of laziness and sloppiness. I examined these "qualities" in detail in the article "The Secret of the Arabian Peninsula". Only one tribe - a trading tribe, originally from the desert on the border of Yemen and Saudi Arabia, on the brink of survival descended to the sea, overcoming their hostility to some of the "trading qualities" (sociability, overcoming the hostility of "outsiders"). The second part of these qualities was developed in the process of trade (intelligence, competence, choosing the necessary from the unnecessary, overcoming obstacles). But the main one among these qualities was the "two-stage reaction", that is, not to immediately respond to the reaction of your body to external stimuli, but first - to think, at least for a moment.

Therefore, when historians talk about trade, they are talking complete nonsense. Their entire history of trade is based on silks and spices, nothing else. Remember the Great Silk Road? And the Great Spice Road from India and Arabia? Meanwhile, one camel can bring so much silk and spices that all the kings and the king's daughters can wear, not carry silk, and even the king's servants can be provided with spices, ginger and pepper. The rest of the people did not wear silk, and instead of overseas "spices" they picked dill and parsley in the forest and put them in food. I based the entire history of trade on salt, which in ancient times was, roughly speaking, only in one place - in the Khazar Khaganate, on the lakes Elton and Baskunchak. But the trading tribe, naturally, did not start with salt.

It came to one tribe on the coast of the Indian Ocean and exchanged with them what this tribe had a lot of, for example, coffee, for next to nothing, of course. And carried it to where there was a shortage of this product, and in exchange took what they had - like dirt. Then, with the help of local tribes, they learned to sail along the coast in papyrus boats, life became more fun. The local tribes did not sail along the coast, there was no need. They sailed to the sea and back, caught fish. Since then, the trading tribe's entire life is connected with water. I wrote about this in another work. They got to India on one side, and to Ethiopia on the other. Then they sailed to the Persian Gulf, and then – all over the world, improving the rules of trade along the way, mainly the rules of penetrating into the people, quietly, without cataclysms. Only later,

having begun to think a little, the people understood that they were not such “selfless money changers”. In general, they began to “persecute” them, and everywhere. Then they came up with money, first in the form of shells, then they got to gold – the “universal equivalent”.

It seems I have reached the language. Naturally, each tribe had its own language, although they had much in common, for example, the imitation of the roar of an animal, the cry of a bird, the hiss of a snake. Note that for any people living autonomously, three dozen words are enough in the language, like in Elochka the Cannibal by Ilf and Petrov. For love, you don’t need a language at all, even today, with the exception of, say, let’s go to the registry office or to the “priest”. For hunting, you need to know the names of several animals and several pieces of tools for catching and killing. For family life, you need even fewer words: spoon, cup, children, grandma and grandpa. Even today, spouses sometimes exchange only these words in a day. Of course, some verbs are also needed: give, take, went, killed, caught, sleep and eat.

It’s a different matter in trade. In this tribe, for example, there is no word for ram, since they eat only fish, and in another tribe, it’s the other way around. They only have rams. But trade is called to exchange fish for mutton, so the two tribes have already learned one word for each. Especially for such clarity, the concept of the word salt should be used, it sounds almost the same in all languages, since not all tribes have salt under their feet. It was transferred to all tribes by traders, because salt in those days was "sweeter" than sugar, that is, more necessary. Without it, you can even die, if you do not drink the blood of animals. In general, trade is impossible without a set of words that is much wider than in each tribe separately. And it is not necessary to invent them, it is enough to use already invented ones and spread them among others in the process of trade. This is how the language of the traders themselves improved first of all. Words of individual tribes began to appear there, denoting completely abstract concepts, for example, spirit, soul. At some point, the language of traders became the richest.

But even without writing, traders are in a very bad way, and other tribes do not need it at all, they are not writing love letters, it is easier to run off. The thing is that at first you need a bill: two rams for a pood of salt, five fish for a leg of lamb. After all, anyone will get confused by the tenth or twentieth example. You need a price list, and not just one, but as many as the trading tribe visits non-trading tribes. Each of these tribes has its own, special price list. And the whole beauty of trade is that you need to use all these price lists at the same time in order to make a profit, and not take "samovars to Tula to sell”. Almost immediately it became clear that in some cases a small amount of one product is equivalent to a large amount of another product, and this small amount is needed by everyone. That's where the money came from. Then they noticed that you can use credit, pay back the money later, but with an increase. Credit notes, credit terms are needed. Abstract concepts of the trading language grew by leaps and bounds and required designation on receipts, clay ones, of course. Then the most intelligent and far-sighted traders wanted to write down the most profitable deals for themselves and their descendants, so that they could go there with knowledge of the market situation, and not find out on the spot that they had brought to sell “a samovar in Tula”, that is, things that were completely unnecessary here. This is how history arose, first a trade one, and then one that reflected the market situation of the local authorities, the kings. They couldn’t go at random.

The rest of the non-trading nations needed all this like a dog needs a fifth leg. Until a certain time, of course. This very “time” came when all the other nations, first of all their kings, noticed that the traders knew an amazing amount, were amazingly clever in their thinking, but they did not know what titanic mental work, self-sacrifice of their feelings, what will to overcome obstacles, all this was achieved.

Therefore, education was accepted by few. The majority still do not want to study, while according to the Torah, every Judean should be literate. The nations did not "reinvent the wheel" either, they simply adopted the Jewish script, and quite stupidly at that. So, at the first stage, the Jews had enough consonant letters for writing, because these letters quite adequately "implied" vowel sounds between themselves. The nations, for whom it was impossible to understand anything from their writing without using vowel letters in combination with consonants, nevertheless began to write only with consonants. Like real monkeys. But historians and linguists are in a very good place today. Every "Greek" or "Latin", completely unambiguous word, written with only consonants, can be "read" today in twenty, if not more, "versions". For example, PRT can be a port, and a pirate, and the Prut River, and as many more as your imagination allows.

Linguists, studying languages today, start from the languages themselves, but not from what they are actually needed for and how they developed. They found “common lexemes” in the “Indo-European” languages and were very happy. But these lexemes are few and far between. All the same, even if there are five common words, the language is considered Indo-European. The rest of the words can be very different, and the crazy linguists still “classify” the language into this idiotic “family” based on one or two percent of words. And the rest of the words, they say, change so quickly that no linguist can keep up with them. Before I had time to write it down, they had already forgotten the word and invented a new one. Thus, for linguists, the only common “lexemes” for all Indo-European languages were the numerals from two to nine, the attractive pronouns of the first and second persons, and the names of some parts of the body and degrees of kinship. Let me quote myself on this subject from the article "The Missing Link of History".

Russian Linguistics

Traces in languages that can only be left by traders, filtering through these "languages"

I will return to the "common lexemes that prove the genetic relationship of Indo-European languages". So, these are numerals from three to five or up to nine. Of course, I understand that even without traders, people knew how to count a little, but necessarily differently for everyone, because it would be sheer idiocy if all peoples from India to England had the same counting system, there is simply nowhere for it to come from if the peoples do not communicate.

Conquerors also cannot transfer the counting system, because they must force the counting system to change. And there are no such conquerors who would go from England to India. Now compare all this with the shyness to trade, which is present in almost all peoples except the Jews. I have examined the human qualities of professional traders in detail in a special article. Add to this that there cannot be more than 5 percent of traders among a non-trading tribe, otherwise they will compete and conflict, so they need to comb the nations, expanding like an explosion in all directions. Also remember, what are the first foreign words you learn when you go abroad? That's right, numerals, and "how much is it?" And now think, will traders learn many hundreds of words to denote numbers from one to nine, or will they unobtrusively force you to learn their own numerals? Especially since for the traders themselves it is necessary to learn many names, and for their clients - a maximum of nine, but only five is possible. In those days, this was more than enough. As Marx used to say: one axe = three sheep. Or: one frock coat = one axe, then the frock coat = three sheep.

Second: personal or attractive pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons, i.e. "I - you", "mine - yours". At the same time, the meticulous Postnikov ("Critical Study of the Chronology of the Ancient World") specifically added: Why only the first two? Because in Indo-European languages, the pronouns of the 3rd person do not

coincide. And why should they coincide at the market? - I ask. The third person is "he - his", "she - hers". They are absolutely inapplicable at the market. I gave the axe and said: this is yours, and the coat is mine. And that's it. And the seller does not need to know at all that "she" will milk the cow. So there is no third person at the market, two are enough. But without knowing the first two persons, moreover, expressed in a uniform manner, it is absolutely impossible to trade. Remember at least how Miklouho-Maclay traded in Polynesia.

Third. The names of some body parts at the market are not needed at all to say "give me your hand, distant comrade", or to exclaim gratefully: what pretty, blue eyes you have, and other compliments. But because all measurements and "weighings" were made by body parts. They weighed with a handful, measured with a "foot", that is, with a leg, or rather, the length of a foot. After all, almost all measurements are based on human parameters: arshin, sazhen, oblique sazhen, vershok, and so on. And the sizes of these "body parts" are approximately the same for everyone, because the Paris Chamber of Weights and Measures did not yet exist, much less the "standard platinum-iridium meter". And all the ancient standards are always with you, and were remembered according to the same principle as numerals.

There are "some terms of kinship" left, the same in all languages of the Indo-European group or family of languages. It's a pity that they are not listed, I would have found a place for them in trade. Of course, there is no mother-in-law there, the relationship is too insignificant. But they often say "brother" at the market, which is why "bros" came about. This is to evoke the greatest possible trust, completely out of thin air.

Note that I have examined the full list of "signs" that determine the relationship to the Indo-European family of languages. The remaining words may be completely different, but this does not affect the relationship of this language to this very notorious family. This section is the greatest proof of the presence of the language of traders in all the peoples through which they seeped. And if in the Japanese language, for example, the same numerals turn out to be, then I take my words back. But they will not turn out to be.

And the last thing. I do not really believe that so many scientists who have dedicated their entire lives to studying the "Indo-European family of languages" could not figure out what I wrote. Then there is only one thing left: scientists, and among them most of the Jews are first-class literates, are very modest.

My previous studies of Russian words

Language does not improve without urgent need. The tribes scattered throughout the Russian taiga had their own, extremely meager vocabulary, consisting of the most essential words, the main one of which was water. And not because "without water, neither here nor there", but because water in the sense of a river is the only way in any direction. There were simply no other ways. And from the word water came many other words in the Russian language, including vodka - a wire (provodka in Russian – Translator) (root "vod") on water (voda in Russian – Translator). And from this vodka, that is, driving where you need to go, came the vodka that we drink. And it leads (privodit in Russian – Translator) (see, again the root "vod") exactly to where you drank yesterday to cure your hangover, to feel better. And this, you know? Bondaging (zakabalenie in Russian – Translator), servitude (kabala in Russian – Translator) and even - a tavern (kabak in Russian – Translator), bonded dependence (kabalnaya zavisimost in Russian – Translator), selling yourself into bondage (kabala in Russian – Translator) and so on. This is how Russian slavery and serfdom began. And vodka was invented for us by traders, Jews, who came to us from the Khazar Khaganate. Because it is a very complex process for our Russian mind of that time. So, water (voda in Russian – Translator) - vodka-action - vodka-drink - tavern (kabak in Russian – Translator) – bondage (kabala in Russian – Translator). I conducted

this research to restore the true priority in the distillation of vodka of the Jews and to take this priority away from the Russians, especially since back in the 19th century, not a single Russian knew how to distill vodka. And when the Russian government decided to prohibit Jews from distilling vodka, this decree was postponed in execution until "Russian craftsmen learn this craft from the Jews".

The Russians did not have eunuchs until a certain point, since they never had a shortage of women, compared to hot countries, the reason for matriarchy. There was no word eunuch (scopec in Russian – Translator). When it was needed, we were forced to take it from the south, skop - see, and eunuch in Russian is kazhennik, that is, showing, when required, who he really is. Then they called it skopra - a female bird, attacking and tearing with claws. And from skopra they produced a male - scopchik or kopchik, which speaks of the acquisition of the word, since most other words of the feminine gender are derived from the masculine gender, and here is an exception.

From other countries the word konda, kondovy, floated to us, giving the name to many rivers and forests. The Konda River beyond the Urals, flowing through the Kondinskaya Lowland, where a lot of larch grows for piles in Venice. At first the word konda was applicable only to the best, thin-layered forest that grew on dry ground, and then they forgot and began to call strong old trees - kondovye, and defective things – substandard (nycandicia in Russian – Translator). Although kon - just - together, that is, you don't have to run around the entire forest to look for good trees, but here they are, one to one, all together. Naturally, this could not have happened if a merchant had not appeared in these forests and exclaimed a hundred times in a row: kon, kon ... Basta, no need to search anymore. By the way, the word basta came to us from Venice, also often used by merchants, that's it, basta, the end, stop, enough. And we ourselves have already come up with the word strike (zabastovka in Russian – Translator) from it.

Almost a third of Dahl's dictionary is based on the root "goy – outcast (izgoy in Russian – Translator)", which even Dahl "translates" as a pure exclamation: goy esy dobry molodets, although this is again only: this good fellow is a goy. And the Jewish traders call all non-Jews, through whom they seep, "goys", and contemptuously, mockingly. So, when did the Jews first come to us, if all our fairy tales begin: goy yesi...? And we, even forgetting what it means, have produced so many words from this root that it takes your breath away. I have examined this in detail in another work, "The Forgotten Link of History". Here I want to specifically note only that the vocabulary of our people was extremely small before their arrival. But, as I explained above, we didn't need it, just like other nations who hadn't yet learned to buy from Jews and sell to them.

Continuation of the study

Then, when I began to study what kind of idiotic name Ermak is, and Timofeevich at that, I discovered that yarmulke and yarmak are words with the same root, and only Jews wore yarmulkes in Rus'. Even the name Yermolai seemed to me to come from there. It should denote either a yarmulke wearer, or a yarmulke manufacturer, or it should somehow be connected with yarmak and yarmulke. Here I will say that yarmak, according to Dahl, is a small millstone for a hand mill, and yermonia is a small accordion, also hand-held, probably like the one I saw on stage with coupletists, also known as "Tatar".

I know that in the old days Russians often changed letters into one another: erilo – yarilo, elda – yalda, yaponcha – epancha, and so on. Today these words have more or less become commonplace. Yes, and the same Yermolai was often spoken and written as Yarmolai. So it is not surprising that I opened the last volume of Dahl's great work. The very first word "yaralash" confirmed that this eralash is, by and large, just

a mixture of disparate things, and then - a mess. Yargak, also known as ergak (a sheepskin coat with the wool outside), which further proves this change of "ya" into "e". However, I need "yarm" as a modified "erm".

"Yarem" (yoke) is, first of all, pregnancy, burden, as in Deuteronomy: "Let them take ... heifer (maiden) ... she did not do it, and she will not bear the yoke". Only later did it pass, I don't know if it was only among Russians: into a yoke, a collar, and even into a harvest season, harvest, haymaking, reaping. And then into a slave, an oppressed person, a slave. But again, "yarma" is a courageous, tall, lively and brave woman, and this does not seem to fit the original meaning of yoke.

"A fair (yarmarka in Russian – Translator), also known as a yarmonka (do you see the substitution of letters?) is a large trade congress and delivery of goods at a certain time of the year, an annual trade that lasts for weeks. On Makarii (July 25) - the Nizhny Novgorod fair is the birthday girl. And here we need to make a few comments. The pronunciation of yarmonka in the yarmarka is not very far from Ermak. Nearby there is a yarmyak, which is an armyak - a caftan robe, which are still worn in the East today, and the Jews wore it almost until the revolution of 1917 under the name lapserdak. The date of the Nizhny Novgorod fair is also important to me - the hottest time of the year, and the fair lasts for weeks. But it was here that they sold girls to the "Khazars". Maybe they needed "tall women", "yarms", and not exactly three-year-old girls? And the word "yaryga" - originally a low-ranking police officer, for sending and executing various orders, then turned into both yaryga and yaryzhka - a drunkard, a rogue, a swindler and a dissolute person. But such is the job. Here, people also treat junior police officers the same way, a cop, that says it all. Yaryga is also a worker, a farm laborer, a Cossack living in other people's yards. Moreover, yaryga is a Ural-Cossack rafting net for red fish. To yaryzhnichat means to idle in every possible way and drink. But the Cossack robbers did not do anything else either. Maybe they are the lowest Cossack class, depraved to the end, sunk? Then the best place for them is at the girls' fair.

The most incomprehensible word is "yary" with the root yar, which is included in all the previous words, starting with ermak. A Russian ending is attached to it and the longest explanation of Dahl in the entire Dictionary. It is as incomprehensible as "goy". I will describe it in detail, under the headings:

- fiery, ardent;
- angry, evil, fierce, hot, hot-tempered;
- strong, powerful, cruel, harsh;
- fast, brisk, unstoppable, quick;
- extremely zealous, ardent;
- molten, fusible, highly flammable;
- white, shiny, bright;
- hot, lustful.

Further, Dahl gives examples of the use of this word, starting with the Bible, naturally, in the Russian translation. I feared you, for you are a fierce (yaryi – Tr.) man (Gospel of Luke). (Remember, goy esi?). An ardent (yaryi – Tr.) husband is not comely (Proverbs). "Spas is fierce (yaroe – Tr.) eye" (an icon of the Savior with a punitive look). A sharp knife is fierce (yaryi – Tr.) - sharp (another word needs to be added to the list). Don't live yaro, or you'll wear yourself out! (Another word needs to be added - something like - at the top of

your lungs). Yaryi cast iron is white, brittle (another additional word). Yaryi cast iron, yaraya copper flows, molten. This means that yaryi cast iron is brittle, and yaraya copper is molten. This does not really go together in one word. Yaryi honey from yaryh bees is from today's young swarm or from a paroy, the third generation in one summer. (Add). The yarye sheeps are this summer's, yarki. (Add again). Dahl doesn't even explain the white-eared (beloyaruyu – Translator) wheat. Yarovik is something fiery: a bull-yarovik, a mushroom-yarovik. The poor collector of Russian words is tired. And what should I do? I'll continue.

Yarost, yarizna is a property, a state by adjectives: strong anger, bitterness, ferocity, a burst of senseless, elemental force, but here: lust. Furious (yarostny – Tr.) - brutal, but also diligent, tireless. Yarovisty is lively, fast, zealous. Yarit means to enrage, anger, tease, anger, but also to kindle lust, to be inflamed with lust. Also to lust, to be in heat.

Yarovat is to be fierce, to rage, and also to boil over the fire: yagolnik yaruye means the pot is boiling. Yarovat' means to prepare a field for spring sowing.

Yar is the most heat, fire, ardor.

Yarovan'ye is the action of the verb yarun, whish is an animal in the season of estrus and growth. The camel yarun is angry.

Yarovoy grain or yarovoe is an annual crop, sown in the spring and harvested in the fall: wheat, oats, barley, millet, buckwheat, the opposite of winter, winter crop, which is sown in the fall and the shoots overwinter: rye, but there is also wheat.

Yarun is someone, who yaruet, more about the carnal.

Yarun is a grip on wheels for large jugs.

Yarunok is a carpenter's square in half a right angle (45 o). Tabachek-yarunok - strong.

Yar, yaritsa, yarovina, yarina are yarovoye. In addition, yar` and yarina are the fat, juice, plant power of the soil, especially transferred to mushrooms. But also - lips, and black mushroom, embryos under old mushrooms in mushroom nests. Yar copper - poisonous salts used for paints. Verdure (yar – Tr.) copper - copper acetate, green. Venetian verdure (yar – Tr.) - it is also purified. Azure verdure - blue. Verdure grass - greenery, plant paint. Verdure is also sea or river silt, grinding nets and tackle. Yarina - sheep wool.

Yarskoy is rich wheaten bread, loaf baked in a high shard, in a bowl, in a tray.

Yarichny, yarovichny or yarushny is made from spring verdure, barley, oatmeal.

Yarovishche and yarushnik are oatmeal or barley, baked spring bread (there is no wheat there). Yarushnik and yarushmen are pie. Yarushka is a turnover, druchka, semi-spring wheat, sown both in spring and winter.

Yarka, yarochka, yarysh is a young sheep, still spring, not overwintered.

Yarkin, yarochny, yarkovy refers to a yarochka, poyark.

Yaryatin is the first wool from a yarka, poyark.

Yarets is a one-year-old beaver.

Yarchuk means the first puppies from a female dog of the first litter.

Yarilo is an ancient Slavic god of fertility, from whom the earth and all living things are busted with life. In Belarus, he is young, on a white horse, in white clothes and barefoot. In his right hand he holds a human head, in his left - a handful of rye ears. It is celebrated on April 27. Girls go in a round dance, having dressed one as Yarilo, and sing: Yarilo walks through the fields, growing rye, bringing newborns. In other places, a young man is dressed as Yarilo, in others - an old man, and in some places they bury a straw effigy with tears and laughter. This happens on June 30 on All Saints' Day or on the 24th on Trinity on All Saints' Day on different days, or on the first market day in the first week of Petrovka and they eat pies, fish at the market, drink sweet kvass.

Yarilovy means All Saints (Kostroma). Yarilov's fast - festivities.

Bright (Yarkiy – Tr.) light means very bright, blinding.

Yarovodye is a strong flood, high water, destructive streams of spring waters and turbulent rivers. But also means a strong sea tide.

Yar (Tatar) is steep bank or steepness, steep (but not a cliff, not stone), cliff, rapids, ledge like a wall, a rugged bank of a river, lake, ravine, eroded and collapsed bank; but also means a rapid river, a furious current.

Dal himself got a little tired of this confusion and writes: “it seems that we should accept two roots “yar”, one Slavic (rage, bright), the other Tatar (steep, cliff).

Yaryk means a downstream fish, a reverse one, which, having spawned, goes back to the sea.

Yarytsy is military armor, armor, helmet, etc.

Yarysh - see yary, yaretina, yarets - see yary. I really want to ask the late Dahl: which of these several dozen meanings should I look at? And how do I settle on a specific meaning? You can go through meanings for a whole year until it seems, exactly seems, that the meaning is right.

I will draw some conclusions. First. When dozens of meanings of concepts and images are defined by almost just one word, this indicates that the language is very poor. It is not for nothing that today less than a dozen words from this fantastic set remain in our language: yarovy sowing, rage (yarost – Tr.) as an emotion, bright (yariy – Tr.) as the power of light, and yarmarka in the sense of a bazaar. All the rest have sunk into oblivion as completely unacceptable for the world of language, which has become "multicolored".

Second. There is no doubt that the most ancient and original meaning of the root yar is of sexual and reproductive origin. But these are the first things that a person remembers from his history. In the book I mentioned, I even have a chapter called “Gods and Incest”. To copulate is the primary desire, and everything connected with it is called “er” or “yar”. Notice how short and bright it is. That is why this bright feeling is also yar. Then it becomes clear that any lips, whether genital or mouth, are also yar. And the “juice” that contains “plant forces” is yar. Yarun is a carnal feeling, ermak is a hand millstone resembling the head of the penis – yar. Then yarun is not only a carnal feeling, but also what it is achieved by. Then it is clear why sexual ecstasy is also designated by rage, fire, passion, ferocity, and yarit' - to kindle this feeling, that is, the flesh, to prepare for it, to self-excite. And it is absolutely clear that "An ardent (yaryi – Tr.) husband is not comely", as it is written in the Holy Scripture. He is also "a gust of storm". But any "ardent husband" will not do without his second half, if he does not use his knowledge of masturbation and other perversions, remember, forced ones, which over time have been widely cultivated and have become stuck

in the genes. Note, yarovy - virginal, I would rather change it to virginal, "yarovaya". And "ozimaya" is no longer a virgin, she has survived the winter, she was not left without a yoke. A yoke-pregnancy does not do without a yarun, then under the canopy of the "yoke" - a strong woman, "mushroom babies" appear - "mushroom yar". And yarolash (eralash) will not remain without an explanation. The fact is that the so-called promiscuity sin or group copulation at the "festival of promiscuity" is nothing more than a "mixture of the heterogeneous", which is what eralash means, gradually losing its original meaning and turning into disorder in general. Family is order. And "yarak" - a sheepskin coat will not remain idle, they spread it, you know why. And Yarmolai-Yermolai will not be wasted in vain. It is now clear to me that this name is not related to Emak, but, if you like, to lust.

Of course, I could return again to all the words with the root yar and illustrate them all with the put forward principle, but why? Everything is clear anyway. I'll focus on words that are not clearly associated with sex, pregnancy and childbirth. For example, a fair (yarmarka – Tr.). If you don't know that our Russian history began with the sale of girls on the Volga (see the book and my other articles), then you won't get to the fair (yarmarka – Tr.) via the sex-yar. And our historians, one and all, make us sell sables, hemp and lard. What nonsense! We never had iron, and our dukes were all warlike. And do you know how much hemp you need for one "Persian" sabre? And sables. After all, not everyone in Persia wore sables. That's just it. We had nothing to sell except girls. And no one would sail to us for hemp so often. For girls, that's a different matter, especially since they had a very acute shortage there in those days. That is why it got its name, yarmarka or fair, from its main commodity. And the "Persians" don't eat lard at all.

I'll look at some more words that are vaguely derived from "sex", although they contain the root "yar". "Spas - a fiery eye" is a portrait of Christ. It may be an apocalyptic portrait of the "Savior", where he is very severe, even too severe. I specifically considered this in one of my works. Yary cast iron is fast cast iron, but bad. Yaraya copper, I think, is not molten as Dahl thinks, but pure, that is, weak, floating, good for nothing, precocious. But when mixed with tin - you get bronze, and "copper" ceases to be precocious. Dahl divides the root yar into two parts: Tatar with a coastal cliff, and Russian with ardor, heat and fire. I think this should not be done. It's just that Tatars compare an orgasm with falling from a cliff, and Russians - with fire, that's all. The Russians were especially dashing and witty when they called a "handle on wheels for very heavy jugs" (yarun) a "man's complete device". It looks similar, doesn't it? Of course, when guns appeared, a complete analogy appeared in the picture. Here we should also include a yarun at 45 degrees, so to speak, a yarun - in a "combat" position, a "naughty one". But "yar" of all colors, remember, azure, green, should be attributed not to paint, but to a fierce selection of the colored, that is, to paint - to highlight. Yar as "silt grinding fishermen's nets", I would also discard, and replace it with a simple snag that sticks out on the bottom like "yar" and tears the nets. Yarina as just "sheep's wool" I would replace with a hayloft for clarity, in the villages this is a very common place for a rendezvous, with some consequences.

Yaryk - a downstream fish (sturgeon), rolling down to the Caspian Sea, I would also define as Russian girls bought by the "Persians" at a fair. They also roll down to the sea from their birthplaces just like downstream fish. With yarytsy-armor - it is more complicated. But, if we take the point of view that for one sable on the Volga they sold a dozen girls, which, by the way, can be seen in the picture in the Königsberg Chronicle, then girls for a merchant are like a shield, while Cossack robbers and ushkuiniks catch girls, the merchant himself can run away.

I move on to Yarilo - an ancient Russian god. Firstly, that he is a man, while other peoples at that time had only mothers-goddesses, proves that we did not have a matriarchy. I devoted half a book to this.

Secondly, the root yar is purely Russian and was not brought to us by a trading tribe. And the fact that we translated the Bible using this word means that in the Hebrew Bible itself the word copulation was different. Dahl, naturally, could not collect the whole history of Yarilo, he had a different task. But what he wrote about this god gives good food for thought. Firstly, young Yarilo is not buried by girls, there is no need, but old Yarilo is buried. As they say, he was, but he is gone. Young Yarilo is celebrated on April 27 - the most appropriate time for this very thing, such as it is, considering that the female clan lay in their dens all winter, and the men - in theirs. Old Yarilo is buried on June 30, an interesting date. This is All Saints' Day, the last of All Saints' Week (June 24) - All Saints. And the Novgorod Fair opened on June 25. Here is also the ancient pagan holiday of promiscuous sexual relations, which became Ivan-Kupala in Christianity, which the hierarchs then foolishly called pagan. Foolishly because Ivan-Kupala and John the Baptist are the same person. The Baptist bathes when he baptizes. And at that time we did not even have the name Ivan. And Vladimir the Red Sun did the same, driving everyone into the Dnieper, and at the same time. It is not in winter to baptize your subjects. And the winter Jordan - an ice hole in the river - is Christ himself who is baptized, not the people. There in their "Palestine" it is always warm. But I digress. The main holiday of Yarilo from the entire All-Saints' Week is precisely at the opening of the fair. Two holidays coincide, Yarilo the old man and the fair. That's the thing. You can sell girls, they had fun.

But I did not do all this for pure linguistics. I need to prove that their own robber dukes sold their own women into slavery. That the Cossack robbers of Russian blood accompanied this "goods" and protected it from each other. That is, the entire Volga was filled with Cossack robbers. And all of them, even the "Tatars", who are also Russians, spoke the same language. The girls were bought by "Persian" merchants - Jews, a trading tribe that visited us periodically. And then the Khazar Khaganate did not exist. That is why the root "yar" and "er" was the same throughout the Volga, from its mouth to Nizhny Novgorod. The robbers grew rich on this slave trade, enslaved the rest of the people, armed with "Persian" sabres, and became princes. Then they fought so much that they were forced to call upon Rurik from the Cossack robbers, who, having tamed them all, became the Grand Duke. Then the Jews came and organized the Khazar Khaganate, the core of which were robbers. Then the merchants penetrated Holy Rus' and built us stone houses, with our own efforts, of course.

Now is the time to move on to another cry common among the Cossack robbers: "Saryn' na kichku!" Here is what Dal writes about this: "There was once a fraudulent or robber language among the Volga robbers, if several conventional sayings and speeches can be called a language; but of it, thank God, only one trace or memory remains, in the sayings: saryn' na kichku, da duvan duvanit. Sa(o)ryn' even now sometimes means rabble, crowd; kichka is the bow of a ship; this was an order for the barge haulers to get out of the way and give up the owner, which was always carried out without question, partly because the barge haulers were unarmed and considered the robbers to be magicians, and partly because the barge haulers had no need for the owner and his goods. Duvan duvanit means to divide the spoils". The word sa(o)ryn' also shows a slightly modified root "yar" in the sense of the so-called "trash" fish, a non-sturgeon species, which was treated with disdain on the Volga. Isn't that where the word "sor" itself comes from?

I think you don't understand how to talk about everything in just one word. Then I'll give you an example. Two miners are loading a mine cart with coal and talking:

- Why the fuck did you fuck so much? (Nahuya nahuyaril dohuya – Tr.)
- Not a fucking lot. Fuck it! (Nihuya ne dohuya. Nahuyarivay! – Tr.)

I don't think you'll need a translation, although you might be very indignant. Like, how can you, what are you allowing yourself to do? and so on. Then I'll give you another example, from classical Russian literature: "And he fucked her, and fucked her, to the point of exhaustion". If you understood anything from what I have stated above, you will not refuse to confirm that the classic uses ancient swear words in the most direct sense and in the most direct expression. With the root "yar". Of course, I understand that in ancient times it was not shameful to speak openly about the most natural human function, otherwise so many derivative words would not have appeared, very figurative, as I have shown. And you, I hope, noticed that in Dahl's explanation they did not seem so to you. There, of these words - just a dump, yeralash, as our ancient ancestors liked to say.

And I also hope that you understood - for a tribe living without wide trade, which in the mass did not see a trading tribe, the dictionary should not be large, the root "er" is more than enough. I wrote about this above.

"**To talk in fenya**"

I will begin with a quote from Dahl: "First of all, the Laman or Ofenian languages. It is far from complete and is limited to the most necessary in everyday life of the khodebshchiki. Its origin is unknown. **Homeland - Aleksinskaya volost Kovrovsky district Vladimir province**, from where already in 1700 khodebshchiki, peddlers scattered throughout Russia, calling themselves by the strange name of Masykov. This trade is now in decline, and with it the language, which, however, has spread, with some cancellations, among the same petty traders in some other provinces: in Kostroma, Tver (Bezhetsk), even in Simbirsk and Ryazan. <…> This invented language is stitched together by many generations gradually from distorted Russian words, which are given, due to some of their relationships, a different meaning. <…> Here is an example: "Misovskoi kurekhoi stremizhnii bendyukh prokhandirili trushchi: **lokhi biryali** koligi i gomza, kubi biryali bryaet i v ustrekhu kundyakov i yagryanyat; alamonnie karyuki kureshchali kureski, lasie meshchati groshalis. That is: On the third day, soldiers passed through our village; the men treated them to mead and wine, the women served them food, and gave them pies, eggs and pancakes for the road; the red-haired girls sang songs, and the little kids laughed. The Vladimir ofeni call their caftan is shistyak, the Simbirsk ones – shersnyak; the sharovary shpyni, Vladimirskoye and chnary, Simbirskoye, the cloth - shersno and vekhno; but most of the words are the same. Some are of direct Russian origin: doors – skripki; a whip - vizzhak; a child - a paschenok; to do - to **mastyrit**; a house - a kurekha; others, unknown: a yard - rym; money - yusy; firewood - voksarii, and so on. Sometimes words are composed one after another, according to the Russian model: God - stod; rich - stod'en'; debt - shilg; long - shilgo; to burn - dulit; hot - dul'noe; sometimes Russian words are given a different meaning: a city is called a coster; to die – otemnet`; the imaginary **similarity of the Ofenian language with Greek** is almost limited to the word khirki, ruki, and it should be remembered that in Nerekhta and Galich mittens are also called nakhiregi. However, penda, five, and dekan, ten, are also remarkable in the Ofen counting, due to the same rapprochement".

Here follows the author's note: "The latest research on this by P.A. Bessonov, who finds many Greek words in Ofen and attributes them **to the ancient times of our trade on the Sea of Sourozh** (Azov - mine), should, it seems, refute my view on this matter - although, for example, I do not know whether the Greek word: bonfire, city (castrum), or was it invented because the city is cut down, built up, and smokes from afar?"

Then continues: "The Kostroma wool-beaters, dragging their bows throughout Rus' and imitating the Kovrovites, also made up their own language, partly adopting Ofen, and partly altering and adding to it with their own composition. Perhaps, I will add, at the end of the dictionary, the dictionaries of Ofen and wool-beaters (I did not add - mine). In the Ryazan and Tver provinces, notorious beggars by trade, swindlers, thieves, horse thieves, and fur-snatchers speak almost the same Ofenian language, with only minor changes, and call it Kantyuzhny. The capital's, especially St. Petersburg's swindlers, pickpockets, and thieves of various trades, known under the name of mazuriks, have invented their own language, although very limited and related exclusively to theft. There are words common with the Ofenian language: **klevyi** - good; zhulik - a knife, but also a thief; **lepen`** - a handkerchief; **shirman** - a pocket; proputlyat' - to sell; but there are few of them, more of their own, for example: butyr' - a policeman; pharaoh - a policeman; strela - a Cossack; kanna - a wild boar; kamyshevka- a crowbar; malchishka - a chisel, and so on. This language, which they call baikovyi, or simply music, is also spoken by all the traders of Apraksin Dvor (the market is mine), presumably due to their connections and the nature of their trade. To know music is to know this language; to walk in music is to engage in thievery. Here is an example of this dialect: Chto **stiril** ? **Srubil** shmel da **vinachil** skurazhnuyu lokhanku. **Strema** , kaplyuzhnik: **peretir** zhuliku da **prikhersya**. A ti? Ugnal skameiku da **pronachil** na vesnukhi. That is: What did you steal? Got a purse and pulled out a silver snuffbox. Listen, policeman: pass it to the boy and pretend to be drunk. And you? Stole a horse and exchanged it for a watch". End of quote. (Emphasis mine).

Firstly, the Ofenian language is alive today, and in part has even become quite "literary". It's a good phrase, isn't it: "srubit`" or "styrit`" "kapusty" from a "loh", that is, money, "zanachit`" from the wife, and then spend it from the "zanachka" to "klyovo" "pobirat`"? (to "steal" or "snatch" money from a "sucker", i.e. money, "hide" it from one's wife, and then spend it from one's "stash" in order to "spend" it "coolly" – Translator). Haven't you come across all these words not only in "tabloid" newspapers, but also in "fiction" literature? But even Dahl 150 years ago considered the Ofenian language to be ancient and even moribund. But it is not only alive and well, but has migrated into literature, and not as a parody or "approach to reality", "naturalism", but as normal Russian words. Moreover, "to botat' po fenya", that is, to speak in Fenya, we don't even know where it came from. What do you mean "from where?" From "ofeni", of course.

Secondly, I am not an expert on "Ofeni" and I am using only what I pulled out of Dahl's quote. And look how many words I highlighted. But what if I study it properly? The birthplace of "ofeni" is the Aleksinskaya volost of the Kovrovsky district of the Vladimir province - this also says a lot. It is not far from where the Klyazma flows into the Volga. This is the very place from which the Khazar Jews penetrated and built Vladimir with hired hands. I wrote about this in detail in another article, about Andrei Bogolyubsky.

Thirdly, the "similarity of the Ofenian language to Greek", which Dahl first denied, and then was forced to admit that, yes, such a similarity exists. But I have already shown in my works that the Greek language is a Jewish language, which later turned into Latin - also Jewish-Christian, since the Italians never spoke it. Bessonov reminds us of the same thing, identifying "Ofenia" with "the ancient times of our trade on the Surozh (Azov) Sea". Only I would like to correct Bessonov about the Surozh Sea. This was much later, when the Ofenia was flourishing in the Vladimir Principality. And the Jews gave birth to them not from the Surozh Sea, but from the Khazar Sea, that is, from the Caspian Sea through the Volga.

I open Dahl's Dictionary to the letter "o" to find out what Ofenia is: "Ofenia see afenya", Dahl answers. I did not listen and looked for words related to Ofenia here, remembering that Muscovites say "karova", and Novgorodians, on the contrary, emphasize "o":

• Ofalit (**falya - blockhead**), Nizhny Novgorod, Kazan: means to cheat, to braid, to deceive.

• Ofit is serpentine, greenery, that is, stone.

• Ophiology is the natural history of snakes, in modern serpentology.

• Ofiglyarit" means to fool, to deceive with buffoonery.

• Ne**ofit** – Greek, means newbie, recruit, newly adopted, novice, newly baptized.

I slammed the Dictionary on the letter "o" and headed to a new address, on the letter "a":

• Aphelion is the point on the planet's path that is farthest from the Sun.

— Affectation – French – is unnaturalness, feelings on display, pretense, memorization.

— Afenya, Ofenia is a walker, a peddler, a peddler with a cab, a fastidious person, a merchant in the delivery and delivery of small towns. It is incredible that afenya was taken from Athens; from the city of Ofen (Pesht) and the Hungarian walkers (Slovaks) - the same; about the imaginary Athenian people of the 7th century, the chronicles are silent; the ofeni themselves call themselves masyks and obzetilniki (mas - I; masy - we; masygi - we, their own, ours; obzetit - to deceive, to cheat; obzetilnik - a rogue). But to ofenitsia means to pray, to be baptized. **Ofest - a cross**. Therefore, Ofenia would simply mean baptized, Orthodox. If in the language of the Ofeni, in addition to khirga, hand, nakhiregi, mittens, and **part of the account**, there are Greek words, then they were originally brought from Surozhye, that is, from the Azov Pomorie and from beyond the Danube. Ofeni count: ekoy, vzyu, (kokur), kumar` (strem, stema), kisera (dshera, chivak), pinda (penda, vychur), shonda, sezum, vondara, devera (kivera), dekan.

• **Afera** - French, is profitable enterprise, turnover from profits; trade or industrial transaction, trade turnover, contract; profit, profits.

• Aferyt` means to engage in turnover, in profits.

• Afernyi is negotiable, profitable.

• **Aferist** is someone, who go for turnover, profitable deals; a hunter of bold calculations, an acquirer, a money-grubber.

• To afinirovat gold, silver means to enrich, bring to the proper standard, cleanse from impurities, allowing only the legal share of silver and copper.

• Afisha – French, is an announcement on paper about some kind of show, performance, or gathering **for money**.

• Aphonia – Greek, is complete loss of voice.

• Aphorism – Greek, is a short and clear saying based on experience and reasoning.

• Afront – French, is a personal insult, an insult to honor, dishonor.

I should start my study of the above words with aphelion, the most distant point of the planetary path, but I will start with an aferist, to show how quickly in public opinion "mostly" positive words turn into completely negative ones. Of course, an aferist originated from afera itself, but undoubtedly – through the verb to aferit` (to engage in turnover) and the adjective afernyi (negotiable, profitable) when the noun of "unknown" origin became sufficiently entrenched in people's consciousness and expanded in

interpretation. Without going into the origin of afera, let us ask ourselves, what is wrong with turnover from profits, a trade or industrial transaction, a profitable enterprise and trade turnover? Figuratively, the Earth rests on these things. Now let us think, why were the words to aferit` and afernyi needed? After all, it seems that trade, also known as turnover, exists without them. And why was the word afera needed? It is also trade and turnover. The word trade turned out to be insufficient because trade used to happen as a one-time, temporary, almost accidental event in the minds of people who were not professionally engaged in trade, but only temporarily seeking its delights. That is, trade through the eyes of a regular buyer and a rare seller. It was then, when people noticed that there were people who were constantly, and not forced to, selling, and what they themselves did not produce, but only resold, that this non-trading tribe needed a name for the trading tribe. Thus, from the afera, an aferist was born - a person of a special character, belonging to the clan of people who constantly buy and simultaneously sell. To be more precise, a person who not only buys and sells, but makes a **constant turnover**. And 150 years ago, there was nothing offensive, derogatory, condemning in the word swindler. Perhaps a little envy, clarifying the word "acquirer" with the word "hoarder", pulling everything to himself. And today? Try calling someone an aferist, either to their face or behind their back. That is, aferists, both by name and by their actions, actually aferists, do not want to be called aferists. Why is that? Because this profession is very profitable, connected with deception, and non-swindlers quickly sensed this. And swindlers did not like this, it is better that no one guessed how good it is to be an aferist. At least in words. It is not forbidden to think silently. It might be forbidden, but how can you do it? Someone else's soul is darkness. But public opinion is nevertheless "formed", both by aferists and by the opposite side.

Now we can move on to the aphelion, the most distant point. To get started, let's take algebra, the science of settlers, who are none other than Jews who appeared in the "homeland" of algebra. I have written about this in other articles, and the mention of "settlers" is to show that settlers are precisely those who are distant from their homeland, right up to the aphelion. Now, how would settlers act if they found themselves in the aphelion, among another people? They would probably start not with building a city, but with a broader penetration and introduction into the "environment", gaining a foothold in it. And how would they call themselves when they met, how would they identify themselves? Some word is needed for this, and something like afeni is quite suitable for this. It is quite understandable in its own circle. And the "environment", hearing it often, how would it call the newcomers, slightly distorting this word in its own way? Precisely afeni (ofeni). And will try to find out, as they say, what do Afenis live on?

Now, when the word afenia has begun to live its own life and characterize a certain human community, its life principles and principles of behavior in the "environment", I will make a poetic digression. It is absolutely necessary here. The fact is that in all my works without exception I characterized the Jews as a tribe chosen by God, completely agreeing with them on this issue. I praised with admiration their intelligence, resourcefulness, determination, assertiveness in achieving their goals. I never tired of repeating that all the greatest discoveries in science were made by Jews, that in all the arts the Jews account for more than half. I allowed myself only to be upset that, like most other non-Jews, I dislike them somewhat. And that is because I could not explain why there is no country where the Jews have not at least once been "persecuted". But this is not enough to explain the phenomenon of the Ofenis. We must also show the "pathetic" Jews, and they exist, no doubt about it.

First, an example from the classics. A very good Russian writer, Garin-Mikhailovsky, now undeservedly almost forgotten, wrote a story about an almost illiterate, needy, pathetic Jew with many children, who

worked as some kind of clerk for a merchant in the middle of the century before last. From morning till night, clicking on the abacus and calculating other people's profits, this Jew discovered one of the foundations of modern mathematical analysis - differential calculus, already discovered a hundred years before him by Euler and Gauss. But the Jew did not know about this, since he had only learned to write and count on the abacus. Having made his discovery, the Jew understood its significance and began to knock on the doors of "government offices", from where he was regularly kicked out, having barely understood the essence of his claims, and not taking the trouble to explain to the Jew in more detail that this discovery already exists and is used for the benefit of humanity. And this miserable man could not understand why they did not want to use his great discovery? That is why, according to Garin's poetics, the Jew was even more pitiful.

An example from my own observations. Having graduated with honors from the Mining Institute, I really wanted to go to work at a scientific institute, and they were waiting for me there, but having learned about the salary, I went to the mine. And I defended my candidate's dissertation only at the age of 40, and even then - without leaving her, my beloved, ... to the point of disgust. But I could tell my wife that my salary was one of the highest in the country, although I drank half of it away, and with enviable regularity. This is, in short, what the mysterious Russian soul is.

Against this background, due to a lack of brains, one of my Jewish peers was able to finish only a technical school, but he still went to work at the same institute, for an even lower salary, corresponding to the title of technician compared to engineer. Despite the fact that he already had two children, which increased to four after the required time. His life was, to say the least, not sweet, it was on the edge of survival with such a large family. But he did not even think of going into the mine, of being like me, an Amhaar, down-to-earth and grounded, that is, roughly speaking, a natural, genetic slave. But only Jews can wriggle out of life's adversities without losing their Jewish "honor", as my Jew did.

Firstly, for lunch in the canteen, instead of a portion of borscht, which cost 20 kopecks at that time, he would take two half-portions of borscht, in two small plates, at half price each, and eat them one after the other with the bread that was “free” in the canteens at that time. He did not take the “second dish”, limiting himself to tea, at two kopecks a glass. In fact, bread was paid for, but its cost was equally included in all dishes, so no one from the canteen staff counted the pieces at the tables, and you could eat as much of it as you wanted. The advantage of two half-portions of borscht instead of one full portion was that my Jew established through statistical analysis: the canteen server, purely automatically, afraid of spilling the edge of the plate with a portion of borscht, slightly underfills it to the brim. And, pouring half a portion into the same plate, firstly, he is not afraid of overfilling, secondly, he is embarrassed that the borsch barely covers the bottom of the plate, and pours taking into account this embarrassment. And the Jew knew for sure that the difference in two half-portions compared to one portion was quite enough for another one or two pieces of bread, which without liquid did not go down the throat. And he did not care at all that not only did the half of the canteen laugh quietly, looking at him, but also specially went to this performance. Despicable Amkhaars, what can you expect from them?

Secondly, you can’t feed a family with such savings. Therefore, the “pathetic” Jew economized his strength at work very much, so that there would be some left over for extra work at home. He did not smoke to save money, but if you sit at the drawing board the whole working day, then you can draw an awful lot. And the “design norm” – 7 or 8 full watman sheets per month – was calculated precisely for Russian smokers, who spent half a day telling jokes “about Brezhnev and the Chukchi” on all the stairwells

and corridors. Therefore, the “pathetic” Jew simply stood like a pillar somewhere alone during the “excess” of his working time, not allowing himself to have more than the required 7-8 sheets slip off his drawing board per month. He clearly did not strive for the “Honor Board”.

The energy not spent at work was devoted to collecting waste paper. In those days, “thick” literary magazines cost pennies, were eagerly subscribed to by the people, and immediately thrown into the trash after reading. The housing problem had not yet been solved by our government, just like today, so a folding bed was put in the place where the “bourgeois” should have had their books at night. And the Soviet government had not yet figured out how to exchange books, which were very scarce and cheap at the time, for receipts for waste paper, in a weight ratio of one to forty, approximately. In this situation, my “pathetic” Jew found his commercial niche, where he spent the remaining strength of 7-8 sheets per month. He tore thick magazines into the fragments of novels and stories that made them up, with the note “to be continued”, and composed complete works from them, bound them very skillfully, signed the titles with the appropriate drawing font, and carried them to the market on weekends. The cycle of this production took exactly a week from and until the weekly “flea market” in a city with a population of about 700 thousand people: a day for collection, a day for sorting, three days for binding work, Saturday, as you understand, a day off at home, Sunday for sale. All the materials needed for bookbinding, from glue to paper and leatherette, were never guarded in the institutes, otherwise the institutes themselves would have to be kept under lock and key all day long like warehouses. And not a single self-respecting scientist goes to the institute without a briefcase, otherwise there is nothing to even run out for vodka with.

I will not dwell on whether such Jews are really pathetic in comparison with steelworkers and miners wielding sledgehammers, with "field workers" who stand for half an hour a day, sleeping during the harvest season and sleeping the rest of the time all day long, with pig farmers and milkmaids with their crooked, "overworked" hands. Each chooses his own, and in early youth, relying on his "genetic apparatus". The main thing is that there are quite a few, even many, such "pathetic" Jews. I could tell you about a Jewish nurse who sells certificate forms for a ruble left and right, but in gloves, so that not even fingerprints remain on them. The same one who carries tanks of manure to her garden in an ambulance. Another Jew, a "scientist" who hangs around the corridor of the institute all day long in case he is invited for a drink, but not to drink, but to eat his fill in the commotion. I am saying that this is not the main thing, the main thing is that there are many of them. And this is exactly what I need to finish about the Ofenia, and at the same time about how "they speak fenya".

I will say right away that although my statistics of words are mostly Russian, this Ofenia is a word, or rather its root, international, pan-European. Ofit and ophiology are "Greek" words, and the Greek language, which later developed into Latin, was not born in Muscovy, all of Europe wrote in it. And these two words come from a snake, actually, an incomprehensible, smart, dodgy creature. It is not for nothing that it was left as an emblem of medicine. At the same time, they do not remember at all how and why this happened, and they invent nonsense, like, they treat with poison. No, they treat no more with poison, any fool knows, but with herbs. The main thing here is not the poison, but the ingenuity in treatment, that is what is required. They say, the French came up with affectation. What, did they just pull it out of thin air? It does not seem like a tricky word, but in its essence it correctly interprets unnaturalness, affectation, ostentation. Do you think that the movements of a snake can be described by at least one “natural” equation? And how unnaturally must the Ofenia wriggle out in order to palm off on you something you absolutely do not need, and at an exorbitant price at that? And if you did not pay attention to the poster calling you to visit some

gathering for money, then I remind you, take another look a little higher. Moreover, note that if any of you explain the origin of all the words I have considered above, of course, not with such nonsense as the emblem of medicine is explained to doctors, then I will immediately apologize, even from the grave.

I will switch back to Russian words. Falia, of course, is an idiot and it is not a sin to ofalit him. But no one will voluntarily call themselves that. It is another matter when you hear such a review about someone else, and remember it forever, like, it will come in handy for vocabulary, let it lie in your head until it is called for, like the same letter in the post office window. But someone must be the first to invent or at least use the word falia, so that others would become envious, and so that they would derive from it the secondary to ofalit. Imagine, at first no one could call us that except for the Jews, and then we got used to calling each other that in the hope that we ourselves personally are not falia at all. Now I will need my lyrical digression about the Jews, the "pathetic" Jews.

Pathetic Jews were sent into orbit, to its very aphelion, that is, into the midst of us, by non-pathetic Jews, of whom there are fewer than we think. That is why I gave a lyrical digression. Just like that, for no reason, it would have been superfluous. And the name of these pathetic Jews was given precisely by the non-pathetic Jews who sent them. Only I cannot find the end here in the actual form of pronunciation and spelling of this word, it is in the depths of the ancient Hebrew or "ancient Greek" language. Most likely, the meaning here is precisely in sending to the aphelion, far, far away.

It's a pity that I forgot to give examples in my lyrical digression about the thirst and skill of Jewish hoarding. Take my word for it that any Jewish family always has an emergency reserve of funds in the hardest currency of the country where it lives, at least in gold rings or "grandmother's" stones from the Soviet Union. In addition, the poorest Jews, when emigrating to Israel, found crazy sums by those Soviet times to pay for their Soviet "free" education and other levies imposed on them by their "native" government. Not a single one stayed precisely because of lack of money.

This Jewish feature, which most fundamentally distinguishes them from Russian men who drink away the money they have immediately and without a trace, served them well in hiring Russian men who are especially resistant to drinking, as the Ofenia.

Needless to say, the course of study was short, and therefore the "Greek language" of the native Ofenias was passed on to the recruits at about the same level as a foreign language is "instilled" in our current tenth-graders after five, and sometimes ten, years of continuous study at school. This is where we should move on to the neophytes. A neophyte is generally a newcomer to some business, and in the second case, a newly baptized person, although still an Ofenia. And how come Ernest Renan didn't guess when he described the newly baptized Jew Hegesippus and other neophytes? But you know very well that in ancient times, Jews were baptized every now and then, and our rulers believed that it was forever, while the neophytes themselves were baptized - for show, for the sake of appearances, in order to become merchants of at least the most worthless guild. At the same time, some fool from the ruling boyars even decided that an Ofenia is a baptized Jew, and therefore ofest is a cross. So they passed it on to Vladimir Dahl through the centuries, and he wrote it down without thinking twice. He had too much work to do. After all, he compiled his Dictionary on a voluntary basis, so to speak, in today's terms - for free.

Ofenia from Russian neophytes is doubly a neophyte, since he does not like to study. And as soon as the number of Russian Ofenias exceeded half, ignorance of the "Greek" language worsened squared. What is surprising is that the "Greek" counting to ten was so distorted that even the Jews stopped recognizing it.

But without counting in a "foreign" way, Ofenia is not Ofenia, therefore khirga - a hand with fingers "in Greek" was their only counting instrument, like a modern computer, and in this form it reached Dahl.

As soon as the ratio of Russian Ofenias to "native" Ofenias reached three quarters, even two thirds as in the Russian parliament for making radical decisions, their whole way of life changed in the same ratio, that is, they began to steal more than sell. That's when the word falya – oluh (a fool – Tr.) appeared, which then simply turned into **loh**, adapting to the Russian articulation in a "foreign" manner. Little by little, with the growth of thieves in the family of neophyte Ofenias, the "o" was lost, and **Ofenia** turned into a simple **fenya**. Needless to say, in the village a new person is always noticeable as a fly in cabbage soup, so professional thieves played the role of an ofeni until it got dark. They knew "Greek" even worse, but they loved the role of "foreigner", just like now "new" Russians hang a sign in English on every smoky hut with gingerbread. Moreover, in such a remote place that it is impossible to find an Englishman there, let alone even imagine it. The lack of knowledge of "Greek" was compensated by breaking one's own language in a "foreign" manner, and that is how the word "to botat`'" appeared, that is, to move one's tongue senselessly, as children babble while looking at a book upside down, trying to prove to their parents that they can not only speak, but also "read". However, adults did the same thing quite recently, for example, our Tsar Vasily Shuisky.

The motto of the native "Greek" Ofenias "if you don't cheat, you won't sell" was adopted by the new-Ofenias without changes and in full. And not only in our country, but also in the "progressive" West. Otherwise, where would their "affront" have appeared at the same time as our "faley" - a bitter and deadly insult from the Ofenia, requiring only blood, otherwise it cannot be washed away. However, when blood cannot be obtained due to the inequality of status, for example, of a French Ofenia and a French marquis, the only way out of the situation was aphonia - complete loss of hearing.

Only the aphorism remained unexplained. From the same West, when it was still very "rotten" for us. But it must be explained based on Russian reality. Older people know what clever sayings and jokes street vendors used to use to attract the attention of lohs-oluhs-faleys. These were aphorisms - short, but absolutely clear and precise formulations-sayings with a fair share of humor like: take a pie - "it unchewed will fly in", or "it can't be hot and damp at the same time" when you complain about a raw, underbaked pancake. Only we did not know that this was an aphorism. The advanced French came up with a special word, and in order to encourage the Ofenias, they named it in their honor. A little over a hundred years later, this word reached our borders. Actually, its ofenian origins were lost along the way, and aphorisms began to be used not so much by the Ofenias as by scientists and writers. A bad example is contagious. This is what the new aphorism looks like.

And aphelion remained unexplained, a distant point - and nothing more. And why is a distant point precisely aphelion? It is still unclear. I should dig into ancient Hebrew. And in general - in the "Semitic-Hamitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic tree of languages".

"Indo-European" linguistics

"Double Bubble"

When you simply say or write the Bible, no questions arise. You know that there was a city of Bybl - Byblos in Phoenicia, there "appeared" the alphabetic Phoenician, strongly reminiscent of the Hebrew, writing and there, they say, the Bible was written, just near Palestine - the homeland of the Jews. Moreover,

the so-called written granite with veins resembling writing is called Jewish stone. But as soon as you want to look at the Bible in the dictionary, you involuntarily stumble over biquadrat, bigamy and even bezaan. Biquadrat and bigamy are understandable, why with the prefix bi, that is, double. The bezaan, that it is also a double or second mast, needs to be proven, since for some time now, even among naval officers, it has been considered the third, stern, mast. Dahl: “In the old days, the bezaan was suspended diagonally, like a clew or a crane on a well. With a half-length, portable sail, a mizzen (did you understand that the mizzen is double, on both sides?). This was when the bezaan was the stern mast of a two-masted vessel. Therefore, in complex names, the bezaan remains only when it belongs to this mast itself. But in the names of the topsail, topmast and all the higher parts of the rigging of this mast, the bezaan is replaced by the word cruis: cruis-topsail, cruis-topmast. The topsail (platform) and the topsail (sail) are called a cruisel. But in the complex names of the other two masts, the mainsail remains unchanged. That is, the main-topsail, the main-topmast. I needed this bezaan (be-zaan, second or double) in order to suggest: isn't the Bible also the Bi-ble, something double or second, secondary?

Naturally, I immediately looked for the word Byblos (Bybl). It turns out that this is the ancient Greek name of the town of Gebal, which is now called Jubail. Knowing that the "ancient Greek" language, which real Greeks never spoke, just like the Italians never spoke "classical" Latin, is just an ancient Hebrew language, I immediately suspected the Jews of covering their tracks. Especially since Byblos, Gebal and Jubail are as little alike as Jerusalem is El-Quds. Although they can be rhymed, but Jerusalem and El-Quds cannot even be rhymed. And this does not stop the whole world from going there and shedding tears at the Wailing Wall, often not even knowing that Jerusalem was not there until recently, and in its place stood the village of El-Quds.

At the next stage I noticed that historians and Christian "enlighteners" really want the Judeans to call their religious and historical books the Bible, while they never called their books that. Dal: "The Bible is the word of God in its entirety, the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testaments; sometimes the latter is separated, and the Old Testament alone is called the Bible”. The Great Soviet: "The Bible (from the Greek biblia, literally books) consists of the Old Testament, recognized as the Holy Scripture by both the Jewish and Christian religions, and the New Testament, recognized only by Christianity”.

Damn it, I think, where have the Jews ever called their "collection" the Bible? They call it the Talmud - "study”. Its ancient part - the Mishnah, which means repetition, gives an interpretation of the norms of the Pentateuch. "The Mishnah gives an interpretation of the Torah (study, law). The Mishna itself was subjected to interpretation (Gemara), which means completion. Together with the Mishna, it (Gemara) makes up the Talmud. I'm copying from the Great Soviet Encyclopedia again: "Torah is the traditional Hebrew name for the Pentateuch”. "The Pentateuch is the first five books of the **Bible (Torah)**: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy”.

Outrageous. Again, the Bible = Torah, is it possible to lie like that? Let's take it in order. I also see one more shameless stretch here. So, there was the Pentateuch. The Jews didn't like this Pentateuch. They began to "interpret" it so that they would like it. The result was a "repeated" interpretation - a "repetition”. But if it's a "repeated interpretation”, then there was also a "primary interpretation”, which, they say, "didn't reach us”. I'll look at this snag later, but for now I'll ignore it. So far it looks like this: if the Mishna interprets the Pentateuch and it also interprets the Torah, then the Pentateuch and the Torah are synonyms, one and the same. But they didn’t like the Mishna either, they reinterpreted it, and got the Gemara. That’s the modern Talmud. That’s all. Where is the place for the word Bible here? And why should

we lie that the Torah is the Bible. It may be equal to the Bible, but the Jews have nothing to do with it. It was Christian theologians who for some reason needed to identify the Torah with the Bible, while the Jews never identified them. Hence the main conclusion that the Bible is a new word, purely Christian, and there is no need to make it so ancient and attribute it to the Jews. I feel why historians needed it. They need the Bible to be lost in the centuries and millennia, that's why they needed the idiotic Bybl. And they called the Bible, that is, a double something, the Bible, combining the root "bl" with the prefix "bi" into one whole. So that we, as in the "riddle" about the green, long, hanging in the living room, and squeaking, would never guess that it was a herring.

To get to the answer to what this double "bliya" is, I will use the method that has proven itself when searching for the meaning of the root "yar" in the previous section. Naturally, I will start with the Russian language. So, in order, Russian words with the root "bl":

- Blavatka – I liked the translation the most – is a cornflower in the rye, a terrible pest of rye fields, light blue. Ukrainian blakytny is also light blue. In English, blue is also light blue, in German is blau.

- Blagiy (good) - has two completely opposite meanings. On the one hand: sensible, good, kind, useful. This is a church concept. On the other hand, a popular concept: evil, angry, stubborn, persistent, wayward, restless, bad, heavy, inconvenient. I did not find a similar word in English, but in German there is the word blahen - to inflate, to swell, to blow up.

The concept of "good" has produced 294 words in Russian, yes, 294. I counted them myself in Dahl's article. Like well-bred, well-mannered, and benevolent.

— Blazh' - Dahl suspects that it was from blazh' that bad folk words came, and from blagoy that good words came, all 294 of them. Although the word blazh' is also ambiguous. It is both stupidity, pretense, madness, and - to exalt, to magnify, to glorify.

— Blaz is pale, white. In German, blaz is also white. In English, bleich - also to whiten, blanch - the same.

— To blebstat means to mumble, to puke, to vomit.

— Blezir means to blurt out for lack of anything better to do. In German, blase is a bubble, and blasen is to inflate it. In English, blad is also a bubble, and blade is a leaf, blade, vane. Blister is a blister.

— Blek is to wither, dry up, bleat, bleat like a sheep. I couldn't find anything close in German, but in English, blab is to chat, and black is black colour, blame is censure, guilt. Bleat is also to bleat, blend is to mix.

— Blend is a deception. This is the name given to minerals that look like useful ones, but are actually useless. In German, blinken is to sparkle, shimmer, and can also be understood as a deceptive sparkle. Blitz is lightning. In English, blend is blind. In German, blind is also blind, but also false, idle.

— Blesk is to play with rays. In German, blau is to copy.

— Blik is a reflection. In German, blick is a look, a glance. In English, blink means to blink, blind means also blind.

— Blanka means an unwritten document. In German, blank means shiny, clean. In English, blank means empty, unwritten, and blanket means a blanket.

— Blin, blon means not only a pancake, but also a shell, a pillowcase. In German, blatt means a leaf, blettareig means puff pastry.

— Blukat' means to confuse, blushva means moss, to become overgrown with moss, blyzhya means frozen dirt, blyuzgat' means to chatter.

— Blusti means to observe, to keep, to protect.

— Blyakha, blyazik — except for the generally accepted – means wrist and basil. English blazon is coat of arms.

— Blyad' is not at all swearing, but merely a deception, an incorrect opinion, a representation. Dahl does not have this word, but I came across it in a "Godly book", where it was written: "this is all a blyad", and not God's truth", that is, criticism of the "heretical" opinion.

I have several German and English words with the sought-after root left, which do not correspond to the Russian words. English: bliss, bless, blare is the sound of a trumpet, to blow, blare is flame, flash, notch on a tree, disclosure, bleet means to bleed, blench means to shake, blood, bloom is a colour scheme. And German blufer is color, flower, bluhen means to flourish, blute is blood, bloz means naked, alone.

There is another word from the Dictionary of Antiquity: "Blemmyes (Coptic, Belehmu is blind) is a nomadic people of **Hamitic** (**Ham? - My**) origin, inhabiting the territory on the right bank of the Nile. Under Diocletian, the Blemmyes were expelled from the Nile Valley to the area south of Sienna (Aswan). In the following centuries, the Blemmyes remained **pagans** (emphasis is mine) and carried out devastating raids on Egypt. The question remains open, with which Nubian tribe of the pharaohs' era the Blemmyes can be identified".

To facilitate the "identification" I will add that Nubia is located on both banks of the Nile to the south of Sienna, exactly where the Blemmyes, "blind pagans", were "expelled" by the very Christian Diocletian, "the son of a freedman", that is, a former slave. Therefore, it must be assumed that the Blemmyes lived somewhere near Alexandria, so that Diocletian would not have to go far. Nubia supplied gold, mercenaries, slaves, ivory, incense, and ebony to ancient Egypt. From the era of the ancient kingdoms, Nubia played an important role in the history of Egypt. It was under the rule of Egypt. In the new kingdom, everything happened the other way around, Egypt was conquered by the Nubians. The Romans got tired of all this, and they destroyed the capital of the Nubians - Napata. And they, not being fools, built a new one - Meroe. In the 4th century AD, the Meroitic kingdom was conquered by the Aksumites. True, this happened after the Blemmyes nomads captured the area south of Sienna, where they were "driven" by Diocletian. Historians were terribly puzzled by this, so to this day they cannot attribute "the Meroitic inscriptions with certainty to any language group". I sympathize, although they could have gone to the "Semitic-Hamitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic tree of languages". They would have been comfortable there, since every single language, without exception, is included in this "tree" (Great Soviet Encyclopedia). You can read my book and other articles on this issue, it's funnier there.

It's not that hard to extract the quintessence from all this historical nonsense about the Blemmyes, if you know that, according to traditional history, Egypt was "owned" by the Ethiopians for a long time. Moreover, this is the "darkest" time of Egyptian history. It is precisely about this time that historians correct the only witness of those times, Herodotus, saying that he "got it all wrong". Even the fact that, in his opinion, the Nile flows in the same direction as the Danube. From which I concluded that ancient Egypt was generally

located in Asia Minor. On this subject, see my selection of articles “The Missing Link of History”. The “Axumites”, who “conquered the Meroitic Kingdom”, are in fact the most ancient empire of Aksum, which included both Ethiopia and Yemen, the homeland of the Jews. Therefore, it turns out that Egypt was ruled by the Jews, and the “blind pagans of the Blemmyes” are simply the local population of Egypt, into which a trading tribe infiltrated and subjugated in a completely peaceful manner. That is why this part of history is completely “dark”, because the main historians are Jews themselves, to this day.

Let me analyze this data. In my opinion, the most important thing here is that the Blemmyes are blind, that is, pagans. And do you know what the most important prayer of the Jews is? To thank God Yahweh every day for not creating a Jew as a pagan, a woman and a despised Amhaar - a toiler of the earth, in general, down to earth, like cattle, meaningless. And here one of the meanings of the root "bl" involuntarily attracts attention - blind, false, both in German and in English, and in Russian - wandering (i.e. blukayushiy – Translator) in the dark. They are just like blemmyes, aren't they? Moreover, simultaneously in three languages.

The second meaning of this root, again in all three languages, is a pancake (Russian, blin – Tr.), a sheet or puff pastry, "sheet" dough, and a bedspread, a blanket. Doesn't this monotony remind you of a sheet of papyrus, parchment or paper? There were no books, as such, bound together. At the same time, I thought that sheep bleat the same way in all languages, but the root "bl" in all three languages is bleating. The thought involuntarily creeps in that these "sheets" must be the same for all peoples, like a carbon copy. It is not for nothing that in German this same root is part of the word "to copy". In all three languages, the root "bl" is also part of the definition of blue, only in Russian - somewhat indirectly, through a light blue harmful flower. True, I am not strong in color cabalism and magic, so I have nothing to say about this. Although, if you pay attention to the fact that the word white in all three languages has the same root, then it is quite possible to assume that white is purification, and precisely there, in the blue skies. I could not miss the fact that in all three languages "bl" is an unwritten letter or a dry sheet, clean and empty. But this probably does not apply to the sheet itself, but to those for whom the “form” will be filled in – their heads are empty for now. This emptiness needs to be filled.

Again, the meaning of a glare, a shine, a glance, a look, a moment – in all languages mean practically the same thing, figuratively, a “divine spark” that needs to be “planted”. And a plaque, a coat of arms is also suitable for this, that is, a sign, a token, a banner, finally. Blood, paint and bloom in German and English in the root “bl”, in my opinion, means prosaic coloring of a sheet, so that it is beautiful, not with pictures, but in meaning, with letters. In Russian, this colorful thing was expressed not by color, but by an ambiguous blago-blazh, blusti-blukaniye.

It is also noteworthy that not everyone liked all this. It is not for nothing that the same root “penetrated” the words in all three languages denoting deception, censure and even cowardice. But if we remember that simultaneously with the "penetration" of Christianity into the masses, there arose such a strong opposition to it from intelligent people, then there is nothing surprising here. Look, for example, about Celsus, Lucian in the previous articles. They were only 150 years younger than Christ, and they were undoubtedly the same age as the Bible.

This study brought me closer to understanding the double "Blia", which can already be called a double sheet or a double book. I have not yet considered the main argument. But first, I will draw your attention to the fact that you may not understand how it is possible to explain "about everything" with only words from

one root "bl"? Look at the previous section, especially at its end, and the question will automatically be removed. It is not for nothing that I prefaced this section with it.

My main argument is in the bubble, blister, inflating a bubble, which in all languages have the same root "bl". But it requires a long explanation, especially for those who did not play with these same bubbles in childhood. In my childhood, already in the Soviet era, "personal" animals killed for meat were eaten, and the skins, intestines and bladders were thrown away. Before I was born, almost everything was put to use: rawhide, sausage, chicken pies and so on. The Soviet government paid for all this raw material as much as it cost to walk ten steps, and making sausage, even for yourself, was considered an illegal trade, so they began to simply throw it all away. And these were our only toys, plus knucklebones and wooden blocks. That's why I am a great specialist in bladders. But before, I somehow never had to remember this specialty of mine. The double "bliya" forced me to.

We washed these bladders and intestines, degreased them, scraped them, and then inflated them. The bubble turned into a balloon, a football, a volleyball, and an empty sausage was made from intestines, we turned it into a torus (a steering wheel, a life preserver) and kicked it too. Just like the children of the century I am writing about. When a bladder or torus burst, we even wrote and drew on it, since there was no other newspaper except for the newspaper Pravda, the Great Patriotic War was going on, and the Great October Socialist Revolution had finally ended recently.

And now, 60 years later, having returned to my childhood, I suddenly realized that I categorically disagree with historians who say that the ancient people of Europe actually began writing with the creation of parchment, ignoring these very bladders. The fact is that a bladder, if you kick it around well on a village street, is ready-made parchment. But there are few bubbles in an animal, and you need to write a lot. Therefore, animal skin began to be added to the bubbles, which became quite labour-intensive. And now they say that parchment was expensive. So now I have no doubt that parchment "came" from bubbles. It's so natural. I would just add that animals have only one bladder, but their intestines are ten times larger in area, especially in herbivores, which are what we mainly eat. And the intestines, I repeat, we rolled into a torus. I hope you understand the reason why I am fixated on the torus, you just need to write it in capital letters - Tor or Torah, what children play with, and adults read and study. And this word is Jewish, although not a single dictionary writes about it. On the contrary, it's hard with all my might that I don't equate torus and Torah, and write that, supposedly, torus is one thing, and Torah is something completely different.

Then I dug into the dictionaries. "Thor - at first just a swelling, an inflating, a bulge". "In ancient Scandinavia - the god of thunder and lightning, the patron of agriculture". I immediately forgot about thunder, lightning and "patron", since there is no god without thunder and a clasp, and that he would not be the "patron of agriculture". I thought that it would be more logical if we believed that the Scandinavians simply prayed to the "bubble" or the torus of intestines.

But this is already better: "The Torah is a parchment scroll kept in a synagogue". In another dictionary: "Torus was previously imagined as just a surface", a non-volumetric body, as it seems mathematically, - I add. Of course, Of course, I immediately cross out “parchment scroll” and write “bubble” instead, which the children tore apart after playing with it, and the adults wrote their Kabbalah on the tattered piece, using the surface rather than the volume. They switched to parchment much later, when there weren't enough bubbles for all the synagogues.

But here's what's strange. Instead of using the already familiar word Torah (‘tor’) and writing honestly and naively “Bi-Torah” (Bitorah), meaning Double Torah, referring to the addition of the Gospels to the traditional Torah, Europeans write God knows what. Although not exactly God knows what. They again, like at the dawn of the world, write: Double Bubble, referring to the entire range of the root “bl” that I discussed above. And then they also invent the city of Byblos, which is completely out of place together with poor Jubail. Moreover, they are trying their best to explain to the stupid flock that the Torah in the part of the Old Testament is also the Bible, although there is not even a hint about this in the Judean books. I thought about it. I remembered that I wrote an article "Jesus" in the "Missing Link of History" complex about how the Apocalypse and Christ are two peas in a pod. And the Jews invented Christ in order to bring all the nations through which the Jews were filtered to a new faith, very convenient for the Jews, but not to the Jewish one. And they camouflaged their old faith, the Judean one, so that no one would ever understand where their "First Law" was, and where Deuteronomy was. But more on that in the next section.

I will finish this section by saying that the mentioned “blind” Blemmyas, which Europeans could not have known about at all, since there was no Roman Emperor Diocletian in Egypt, just as there was no Roman Empire, give me reason to suspect that it was the Jews who did not allow Christian biblical scholars to call the Bible BiTorah, so as not to expose themselves too much. This is also evidenced by the fact of a formal audit check by a certain Jew Hegesippus of all Roman Catholic churches for the “correctness” of their Christianity. Details in the book.

Mishnah – Repetition. Of what?

Have you forgotten yet that the Mishnah in the previous section of the encyclopedia is interpreted as the first interpretation of the Torah, but for some reason it is called Repetition? I return to the incomprehensibility of the repeated interpretation, without mentioning the primary interpretation. I don’t mean the Gemara, which thus becomes the third interpretation, but the Mishnah – “repetition”. I have my own, and quite weighty, reasons for this. The thing is that, as you have seen, the Torah includes Deuteronomy, which is also Deuteronomy without the “First Law”. And please note that the Judeans themselves are not at all interested in this confusion. They seem to know in advance what the matter is. They say that Moses received life instructions from Yahweh, got angry with his people, and broke these stone tablets – the tablets with the recording of Yahweh’s thoughts and wishes for the Jews. The broken tablets contained the “First Law”. Then he climbed the mountain to Yahweh again and brought new tablets – Deuteronomy. The Jews don’t even remember the “First Law” anymore, as if it never existed. They live by Deuteronomy. Therefore, I have no doubt that the first edition of the Mishna, unlike the Mishna-Repetition, was precisely an interpretation of the "First Law". I will repeat once again: the Jews are not at all interested in the "First Law" and the Mishna-Not-Repetition. They know that it is nonsense. Nonsense should simply be forgotten and not bothered with it.

But Christian biblical scholars were running off their feet to find out what was in this "First Law" and why Moses broke it into small stones that could not even be read? The very fact of the Judeans` imperturbable calm on this issue and the vanity of Christians on it, says a lot.

So, the ideology of Judaism changed twice. The first time, God Yahweh gave Moses the first batch of "stone tablets" with the Ten Commandments, then replaced them with a new batch of stone tablets. I give the floor to Frazer (Chapter 2, “The young goat is not to be cooked in its mother's milk”, in the book “Folklore in the Old Testament”. Moscow, Political Literature Publishing House, 1986):

“Here we are talking about one of the “ten commandments”. We mean Chapter 34 of Exodus. In it we read the story of what is commonly considered to be the secondary proclamation of the “ten commandments” to Moses after he, in his anger at the idolatry of the Jews, broke the stone tablets on which the commandments were written in their original version. Therefore, in the chapter mentioned we have nothing other than the second edition of the “ten commandments”. That this is precisely so, and not otherwise, follows with complete certainty from the verses that serve as the introductory and concluding parts to the list of the commandments themselves. Indeed, the chapter begins thus: "And the Lord said unto Moses: Hew thee two tablets of stone like the first: and I will write upon these tablets the words that were upon the first tablets which thou didst break”. Then follows the account of God's conversation with Moses on Mount Sinai, and the text of the commandments. And in conclusion it is said: "And the Lord said unto Moses: Write thou these words: for in these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel. And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the Ten Commandments”. Thus, the author of the present chapter undoubtedly regarded the commands of God contained therein as "the ten commandments”. But here a difficulty arises. The fact is that the commandments noted in Exodus chapter 34 only partially coincide with their text, set out in the much more popular version of the Decalogue, which we read in Exodus chapter 20, as well as in Deuteronomy chapter 5. (The “popular” version – with the moral commandments – is mine).

Here is the list of commandments given by Professor K. Buddha in his “History of Ancient Jewish Literature”, based on the version of the Decalogue in Exodus 34, with the exception of one commandment, which, according to his parallel version, is set forth in the Book of the Covenant:

1. Do not worship another god.

2. Do not make yourself molten gods.

3. All the firstborn belong to me.

4. Six days you shall work, and on the seventh day you shall rest.

5. Observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread in the month when the grain ripens.

6. Observe the Feast of Weeks, the Feast of the First Fruits of the Wheat Harvest, and the Feast of Ingathering at the end of the year.

7. Do not pour out the blood of my sacrifice on leavened bread.

8. Do not let the fat of my feast be kept all night till the morning.

9. Bring the first fruits of your land to the house of the Lord your God.

10. The young goat is not to be cooked in its mother's milk.

This is the same list of commandments as proposed by Wellhausen, with the only difference that he omits "Six days you shall work, and on the seventh day you shall rest" and instead introduces "Observe the festival of ingathering at the end of the year" as an independent commandment, and not part of another. Professor Kennett gives, in general, the same list of commandments, but, unlike Buddha, he singles out the festival of ingathering as a special commandment, and, unlike Wellhausen, he retains the law of the Sabbath rest; in contrast to both, he omits the prohibition "Do not make yourself molten gods" In general, his

construction of the Decalogue is also based mainly on the version contained in the 34th chapter of Exodus, and is presented as follows:

1. I am Jehovah thy God; thou shalt not worship another god.

2. Thou shalt observe the festival of unleavened bread: seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread.

3. Everything that opens the womb is mine, and also all your male cattle, the firstborn of the ox and the flock.

4. You shall keep my Sabbaths; six days you shall labor, and on the seventh day you shall rest.

5. You shall keep the Feast of Weeks, the Feast of the Firstfruits of the wheat harvest.

6. You shall keep the Feast of Ingathering at the end of the year.

7. You shall not pour out (literally, you shall not kill) the blood of my sacrifice on leavened bread.

8. The fat of my sacrifice shall not remain all night until the morning (Ex. 23:18). In another place (Ex. 34:25) this law is limited to the Passover sacrifice.

9. The very first fruits of your land you shall bring into the house of the Lord your God.

10. The young goat is not to be cooked in its mother's milk.

Whichever of these versions of the Decalogue (Deuteronomy – mine) we take, each of them differs sharply from **the version of the Ten Commandments we are accustomed to. Moral standards are completely absent from them**. Without exception, all the commandments relate entirely to matters of ritual. All of them are strictly religious in nature, defining in the most scrupulous way the petty details of man’s relationship to God. **Not a word is said about the relationship of man to man**. God appears in these commandments before people as a feudal lord before his vassals. He demands from them strict fulfillment of all duties, and **their internal relationships**, since they do not concern these feudal duties, **do not interest him at all**. How different all this is from the remarkable six commandments of another version: “Honor your father and your mother. … Do not kill. Do not commit adultery. Do not steal. Do not bear false witness against your neighbor. Do not covet your neighbor's house; "You shall not covet your neighbor's wife, nor his male servant, nor his female servant, nor his ox, nor his donkey, nor anything that is your neighbor's”.

If we ask ourselves which of these two divergent versions is older, there can be only one answer**. It would be strange to suppose**, contrary to all historical analogies, **that the moral rules that were originally part of the ancient code were subsequently thrown out** and replaced by the rules of religious ritual. Does it seem likely, for example, that the commandment "You shall not steal" was later removed from the code and replaced by the instruction: "The fat of my sacrifice shall not remain all night until the morning"? Is it possible to imagine that the commandment "You shall not kill" was supplanted by another - "The young goat is not to be cooked in its mother's milk"? End of quote. Emphasis is mine.

Frazer then gives numerous examples from the lives of semi-savage tribes of Africa, who never boil milk, since this can lead to the animals losing their milk, and derives the tenth commandment from this. He continues: "But such an interpretation implies a prohibition against boiling a young goat in any milk at all, because a goat is equally subject to spoilage when its milk is boiled, regardless of whether it was the mother of the kid being boiled or not. The special mention of the mother's milk can be explained in two ways: by the fact that mother's milk was usually used for this purpose, and not other milk, or by the fact that in such

a case spoilage of the goat seems an even more probable consequence than in any other case. ... But, one wonders, if we are talking about a negative attitude towards boiling milk itself, then why is the young goat mentioned in the commandment at all? The answer to this question can perhaps be provided by the customs of the Baganda tribe. Here meat boiled in milk is considered a very tasty dish, and mischievous boys, and even shameless adults, who think more of their own pleasure than of the well-being of their flocks, often secretly give in to their sinful desires and treat themselves to this forbidden food, indifferent to the sad fate awaiting the poor cows and goats. Thus, the Jewish commandment "The young goat is not to be cooked in its mother's milk" was probably directed against such villains, whose secret gluttony was condemned by public opinion as a serious threat to the main source of food. Hence, it is understandable why, in the eyes of a primitive pastoral tribe, boiling milk was a more heinous crime than theft or murder. For a thief or a murderer attacks an individual, whereas boiling milk, like poisoning a well, threatens the existence of an entire tribe by corrupting its main source of food".

I am not so much interested in the controversy about the young goat and the milk, as in the fact of the primary and secondary "covenant of the god Yahweh". This is the main point. Secondly, Moses' very deep understanding of the essence of the problem. After all, I know that he did not communicate with any god. Thirdly, the obvious deception of the Israelites, whom he drew into his "campaign" with one "decalogue", and already on the way, when there was no turning back, replaced it with the second decalogue. Fourthly, the second decalogue completely stopped the "wavering" within the faith once and for all, stopped the "scatteredness" of feelings, concentrated them all strictly in one direction. Therefore, Moses was not naive, he had a great brain. This brain could in no way engage in nonsense like the one Frazer presented to us in the previous paragraph about the "poisoned well". Do not you think that "I am Jehovah your God; "Thou shalt not worship another god" is more significant than "preserving thy flock from being spoiled by boiling milk"?

**Thus, Frazer proved that the "First Law" contained moral commandments, and they were removed from Deuteronomy as completely idiotic. This is the genius of Moses, aimed at the well-being of the Jews, but not at all for the good of all nations. For all other nations, the "First Law" remained under the guise of Deuteronomy, "the version of the Ten Commandments familiar to us". But only Christ brought this distorted concept of the Decalogue to all nations.** I have written about this in another article. Here I will say that this is precisely why the Jews try to hide from all other nations that their Deuteronomy is completely different from the Christian-Muslim Deuteronomy. The Christian-Muslim "Deuteronomy" is essentially their "First Law", completely idiotic commandments that can neither be honestly fulfilled nor discarded without false shame. In my book, I have covered in detail the 2,000-year-old futility of instilling moral commandments in people like a conditioned reflex. Only the law and the court have an effect on people. That's how we live with our legs spread out. We can finish here, but it would not be superfluous to try to follow the course of Moses' thought when the tablets were changed.

How would I have acted in Moses' place, and you, dear reader, in the situation that existed at that time? There are a whole bunch of gods, all the people of one country, not to mention different countries, are divided according to gods. Blacksmiths "walk" under Hephaestus, winemakers under Artemis, the military under Mars. Just like today everyone "walks" under different bandit and special service "roofs". There are continuous clashes not between gods, but between people who worship them, but mainly the role of instigators is played by various groups of priests, "serving" one god or another. This had to be stopped, once and for all. I think Moses read history, which had begun to be written not long before him in newly invented

letters. And he concluded that there are continuous wars and they cannot be stopped, but the wars themselves can give nothing, they are almost useless, because they reflect such a variety of reasons that these reasons themselves should be somewhat organized and, if possible, reduced to one or two, better still, to one.

Please read a small digression. I will not tire of repeating this thought. We are accustomed to thinking that 30 years ago people were so stupid because they did not use the Internet and cooled beer with ice not from the refrigerator, but stored from the river in winter. What can we say about 1000 years ago? - they reason. And they do not realize that they themselves often do not imagine how the ice in their refrigerator is made. Therefore, I am surprised when our scientists imagine the thought process of the "ancient sages" as that of a five-year-old child. But this is not true at all. It is enough to remember Newton, when he lived, and what he "thought up" while looking at an apple tree. And how many today are capable of inventing writing? It seems such a simple thing to us, although its idea is no less than the idea of quantum mechanics, which the overwhelming majority of people are not able to imagine at all. That is why I imagine the thought process of outstanding ancient people, free from the daily pursuit of food, to be no worse than the thought process of today's Nobel laureates.

Moses understood that it was necessary to teach all people of his circle, that is, the Jews, to walk a very straight path, without raising their heads at all the signs and advertising posters on the sides. This order should look at the back of each other's heads, and he will be in front, for he alone knows where to lead them. It is not necessary for everyone to know and it is even harmful. Therefore, he created the first commandment: "I am Jehovah your God; you shall not worship another god!" And he never changed it in any of his subsequent editions of the "tablets". This commandment is the foundation of foundations. I am sure that at this stage, he already knew his second edition of the commandments, Deuteronomy, but it was only in his head, it was not covered in the "general press". Why do I think so? Yes, because without the true Jewish Deuteronomy, the second edition contained in the head, there was no point in leading the "Israelites on a campaign", for it would have been doomed to failure already upon leaving "Egypt". For instructions like: "Honor your father and your mother. Do not kill. Do not commit adultery. Do not steal. Do not bear false witness against your neighbor. Do not covet your neighbor's house; do not covet your neighbor's wife, nor his male servant, nor his female servant, nor his ox, nor his donkey, nor anything that is your neighbor's" only bring confusion into the minds of a well-ordered army. On a campaign, the army only needs: "For the Motherland! For Stalin!", in extreme cases: "Hurray!" This is what the Jewish Deuteronomy is, in contrast to the "familiar to everyone" "Deuteronomy", which is the First Law.

The slogan-order given could only be used in a fully organized battalion, company, platoon army, but that was still a long way off. There was no army, there was a secret organization that "studied works". Therefore, different opinions on the same issue arose in it, there were disputes, that is, in modern terms, there was a continuous bazaar, like we have today in the "democratic camp". This had to be stopped. What could unite everyone except a single god, to whom it was somewhat unusual to get used? Simple everyday truths, what else? No one will argue that one must love one's parents and it is desirable "not to desire" one's neighbor's wife. I want to specifically emphasize that at that time, as in the present, everyone desired both the neighbor's wife, and his ox, and his donkey. Because these were very natural desires, and it was not considered a great virtue to hide them. Therefore, to suppress these encroachments in other souls, but not in one's own, everyone considered it a good thing. This was a good basis for attracting the "masses" to

their circles. After all, Christianity and Islam conquered the world on this nonsense. That is, Moses knew what he was doing when he tempted his Jews with this unrealizable dream of the "First Law".

The sensibly used frequent eruptions of Vesuvius or any Ethiopian or Yemeni volcano, there are countless of them, for the creation of a single god, the rules of social coexistence, understandable to all in the conditions of its maturing need, it seems to me, fell on fertile ground, and the new faith gained recognition relatively quickly. But, in the conditions of matriarchy, which still does not fit into the minds of scientists at such a late "stage", there was no place for a new religion. The power of women was strong and unyielding in exactly the same way as the power of the fictitious pharaohs in Ancient Egypt, from where, supposedly, Moses "led his people". I even think that Moses told his former savior, the pharaoh's wife, about monotheism and its advantages. And he was understood. That is why he was so often invited to the pharaoh's palace, to consult, and sometimes with a request to help the "Egyptians" with the help of their new god. But Moses had his own views on the future. He did not invent a new male god who was all-powerful so that he could serve to strengthen matriarchy. And the late Freud, understanding Moses perfectly well, still could not "find a place for mother goddesses" in his "reconstruction of the creation of the world". (Details in the book).

Moses had far-reaching plans, as did Alexander the Great, Napoleon, Lenin and Hitler. You see that I am not mentioning the trading tribe yet, but am reasoning purely abstractly. Unlike the aforementioned schemers, his plans have now been fully realized. He decided to take power away from women and create a patriarchy, which has blossomed in all the colors of the rainbow. Of course, he did not lead the Israelites on any campaign. His comrades went on the campaign among the trading tribe of Jews, who were making their way through the nations like a comb through hair. It was a united army, without any children or flocks of sheep, only with tablets. The stake was on male agitators, and only men were subjected to agitation. His followers had not yet differentiated into the flock proper, and the agitators proper, so they attached too much importance to those same six moral points. These points were suitable for the flock, which was united in faith in the new god. As Freud would say, they identified with each other in their common love for the new god. If Moses had simply wanted to create a new religion, then its creation would have ended at this stage. The new religion would have begun to gain momentum under matriarchy and serve it. But Moses conceived the new religion in order to take away the leading role from women. Therefore, Moses needed people who were completely trusted, completely devoted, but not to him personally, but to his main idea: to drive women to their "rightful place", to take away from them their "historically established" primacy in everything. Therefore, he needed men to whom he could fully reveal his "plans" and receive their unlimited sworn support. A step away from the task exhaustively defined from above was equal to betrayal of the common cause with the corresponding punishment for the traitor. These were the rabbis - teachers.

In the process of agitation based on the "moral" part of the commandments, a differentiation of primary adherents took place, a selection of the most devoted to the final idea, ready to go to the end, not only not to retreat a centimeter to the side, but ready to kill any of their comrades for such a retreat. For them, Moses replaced the "editorial board of God's tablets" by creating "Deuteronomy". All moral commandments for them were thrown aside as absolutely unnecessary. I will repeat Frazer again: “They have no moral standards at all. All the commandments without exception relate entirely to questions of ritual. They are all strictly religious in nature, defining in the most scrupulous manner the petty details of man’s relations with God. Not a word is said about the relations of man to man. God appears in these commandments before men as a feudal lord before his vassals. He demands from them strict fulfillment of

all duties, and their internal relations, insofar as they do not concern these feudal duties, do not interest him in the least”.

Then these new "immoral" commandments were quietly and thunderously introduced into the consciousness of the entire trading tribe, and at first they did not even realize what was what.

Remember Lenin - "a practitioner of revolutionary deeds", who faced exactly the same task as Moses. He had to replace capitalism with communism, just as Moses changed matriarchy for patriarchy. And was there much morality in Lenin's actions? All his actions were immoral. Before the revolution, the Bolsheviks were engaged in ordinary robbery, and in criminal communities at that. With this money, Lenin lived in the most expensive and comfortable Switzerland and published his "Iskra", from which such a "flame" subsequently flared up that the Apocalypse seemed like a harmless Tale of the Gray Wolf and Little Red Riding Hood. Lenin, like Judas, betrayed his brothers, the Social Democrats, the Left Socialist Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks; Stalin, like the continuer of the cause, similar to Joshua, betrayed the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, and so on. Lenin betrayed his own country in the First World War and, using the money of the Germans, the enemies of his country, carried out a revolution. Lenin called on his army to “stick bayonets into the ground” at the very time when things were starting to improve on the Russian fronts, and victory in such a painful war could have gone to it. The Brest-Litovsk Peace is a shame for Russia that was not caused by anything from the outside. On the wave of this shame, he strengthened his personal power, called Soviet without any reason. For, having promised “factories to the workers, land to the peasants”, he immediately took them for his personal and undivided use, later handing them over to his nomenklatura. Lenin, having proclaimed the equality of all, immediately began to "get nails" for his "walkers" - his favorites, and left the rest, the non-walkers, "without nails”. Together with Dzerzhinsky, he began to "forge" his replacements from street children, because almost the entire Special Committee was then organized from them. It was easier to organize terror with the hands of rootless, delinquent boys. With the hands of boys and "poor people" who today live in dumps, eating like birds of the sky, whoever throws out whatever they can.

But Moses was smarter than all the previous and later creators of empires and "changers" of ideology mentioned above, although he lived much earlier than many of them. The fact is that Moses immediately and forever created the world elite on a national principle, and not on a political one, like all the others. In politics, there are always vacillations, in a nation - never. The nation also changes, but all at once, wholesale. Slowly or quickly is another matter, and this change does not relate to internal vacillations. The monolithic nature of politics is destroyed precisely by internal vacillations, almost everyone wants to be smarter than they really are. Therefore, in general, politics is always a prostitute, and a nation as a whole cannot be a prostitute in principle, otherwise it will simply cease to be a nation.

Christ is the first politician. He wanted to create a multinational elite in the form of worshipers, and followed the same Moses` path with the First Law in his hands in order to attract like-minded people with an unrealizable hope. The multinational elite is good in that it arises much faster, and there is a much greater choice from all nations. But he did not have a real Deuteronomy in his soul, free from moral dogmas, completely useless on Earth. Therefore, Judaism is still united, although the Jews are deliberately trying to show us that it is entirely made up of sects. And Christianity first fell apart into Nestorianism and Islam, and then into hundreds of sects and little sects each. I even think that he wanted to entice the Jews to his faith, which is why they disliked him. But when he left them with his idea and allowed them to develop further according to the law of Moses, all their hatred passed, and they simply began to consider him another feeble politician, in general, they forgot that he was once on earth. Complete indifference.

Today, anyone who is even remotely intelligent, and anyone who is not afraid to speak the truth, at least to themselves, knows that the world's elite are Jews, and that they are the ones who rule the world today. But it is already impossible to change anything, and it would be unfair. This nation is too smart, too hardworking, but only without a jackhammer in their hands, too purposeful, and too scattered in the world. That is why I called on Russians in my book not to fight the Jews, it is absolutely useless, and terribly expensive for us ourselves, but to accept their Judaism as a weapon, and first of all their Deuteronomy, free from moral idiotic dogmas. Instead of them, there is, thank God, the law and the court.

And another, purely practical explanation. It is believed among non-Judeans that only Jews can profess Judaism. This is not so. Otherwise, the trading tribe would have died out long ago. Genetics operates equally among all living things. In order to be an absolutely equal Judean, one must love the god Yahweh, strictly follow the instructions of the Torah and, first of all, the true Deuteronomy. Nothing else is needed, absolutely nothing. Neither the color of the hair, nor the width of the base of the Russian nose, nor the shape of the eyes, nor the color of the skin, nothing can become an obstacle to this. It is not for nothing that Israel took almost all the Ethiopian Judeans to its "homeland", although this is not their real homeland.

Competition with Nosovsky and Fomenko

You have already seen that the "origin" of the "Indo-European family of languages" cannot be explained by anything other than trade. Earlier, I also wrote that the "conquests" of peoples in such numbers by various ancient "heroes" are also beyond the power of various ancient "heroes", simply - this is sheer nonsense. But Nosovsky and Fomenko really want the Russians to conquer the whole world. And if this is not even foreseen in the future from today's realities, then at least in relative antiquity to designate this terrible event. I wrote about this extensively in my book, and I did not intend to repeat myself. If not for the pile of examples from "Indo-European linguistics" that they cited. This article of mine is also from linguistics, only on the trade part, and I could not help but use this pile of examples, selected with great care, in alphabetical order. At first I did not want to cite all their data, but only to select those that are closer to trade, but then I thought that I could be accused of "pulling out". So I cite Appendix 7 to Volume II of the book "Biblical Rus'" in full. This appendix is called "Traces of the Great = "Mongol" Empire in Western European Languages". I reserve the right to interfere with the long quote here and there. So.

"It would be extremely interesting to re-analyze the well-known connections between the languages of the Indo-European group from the point of view of the hypothesis that in the distant past, i.e. in the 14th-16th centuries, they were all subjected to a STRONG INFLUENCE from the Slavic language (or languages). Such influence was an inevitable consequence of the Great = "Mongol" conquest and the emergence of a huge Empire. The local languages were superimposed on the Russian (Slavic) and Turkic languages of the Horde-Ataman conquerors; these languages were used for a long time throughout the territory of the Great = "Mongol" Empire. To clarify the idea, we will give here ONLY INDIVIDUAL EXAMPLES, clearly showing what a huge layer of material requires a new understanding. Of course, after the split of the Great = "Mongol" Empire, European languages interacted with each other for several hundred years as more independent ones, and words could flow from language to language in different directions. "The mere fact of similarity of words in different languages does not immediately lead to a conclusion about the direction of borrowing. However, previous linguistic studies of this kind inevitably relied on the Scaligerian chronology. Therefore, it would be interesting to reconsider (from a new point of view) previous theories about the direction of borrowing" (emphasis in capital letters – authors).

I will only supplement the authors who claim everywhere, except for the selected quote, that all nations and continents, with the exception of Australia and Oceania, walked “under the Russian hand”. And I will continue the quote: “Let us point out parallelisms between some Slavic and Western European (English and German) words. Of particular interest are the parallels between basic words, which are not special terms, but are part of the core of the language (family relations, etc.)”.

Before I give a list of the authors’ words, I will remind you that they have thoroughly studied the “core of the Indo-European language family” that I have cited above. That is why they put in first place the degrees of kinship, numerals up to seven, and first and second person pronouns, which I have already written about and explained above, why third person pronouns are not necessary in trade. So, I am copying the table, highlighting the words that clearly relate to trade.

| Russian | English, German, French |
|---|---|
| Kinship ties: | |
| сын | son (English), Sohn (German) |
| дочь, дочери | daughter (English), Tochter (German) |
| брат | brother (English), Bruder (German), frere (French) |
| сестра | sister (English), Schwester (German), soeur (French) |
| мать | mother (English), Mutter, Mutti (German), mere (French) |
| мама | mummy, mamma (English), mum (American), Mama (German), maman (French) |
| тятя, батя | father (English), Vater, Vati, Pati (German), pere (French) |
| вдова | widow (English), Witwe (German), veuf, veuve (French) |
| кум | compere (French): kum + pere “father' |

I can already feel how the authors want to adjust foreign words for Russian "conquests", but we should think about religion and spontaneous sounds that even animals make, not to mention people. A cat and a cow pronounce the sound or letter "m" well in their "words" "meow" and "moo ...”, a pig "knows" the letters "h" and "r" well in the "word" hru, hru ... A dog is also not without "education", it knows the letter "g" in its "gaf-gaf". Therefore, the Russian word "mama" was not brought to Western Europeans by conquerors, but is obtained by many purely automatically: as you hit your finger with a hammer instead of a nail, so you pronounce "m...”, without even thinking about in what language you are complaining about fate? In addition, the authors, I think, not in vain took "tatya and batya", but did not take father. Sorry, this is an obvious adjustment to the answer in the "problem book". Especially with the word "кум".

But the sound similarity is, of course, obvious, but it, in addition to natural sounds, must be sought in religion. Now, if in all the languages of the notorious "Indo-European family" the words brother, sister, mother and father had the same root, I would even believe in "conquests". But this is not the case. Even experienced linguists, who have eaten a dog on comparing languages, are forced to say that "the only common "lexemes" for all Indo-European languages were numerals from two to nine, attractive pronouns of the first and second persons, the names of some parts of the body and degrees of kinship". And the "core" of the Indo-European family of languages "makes up only 1-2 percent of the vocabulary of the languages included there". Having noted to oneself that brother and sister, mother and father, son and daughter in Christianity are more common among non-native speakers of these words than among native speakers, one can move on to a quote from Vladimir Dahl, an unsurpassed practitioner of linguistics who drew his knowledge from the people, not from dictionaries.

"Along with forced education, according to foreign models, in the past, the distortion of the native language began, which could not keep up with the sudden influx of education. <…>…we are beginning to see the inconvenience of filling in the missing with foreign, we are beginning to refuse the arbitrary breaking, pairing and welding of words. These attempts are mostly very unsuccessful and are based on the actual lack of knowledge of the vernacular, in its entirety. We have no shortage of words and expressions, you just have to be able to find them, study them, learn them and put them into use. <…>…for example, one translated novel is given the cleverly invented title "Guide to the Desert", a tricky, mysterious title, while the literal translation of this title would be: "Steppe Leader". Much water has flowed under the bridge since 1863, you can no longer understand the ridiculousness of replacing the steppe leader with a guide to the desert. Then let me remind you that a broker is a breaker, even a "wrecker", a distributor is a spreader, a promoter is a distorted patron, founder, and a sponsor in general is a simple customer of the "body", an organizer of "fate". Recently a store driver delivering purchases asked me to call him a dealer, and when I began to explain to him that a driver sounds better than a pusher, he became even more offended.

Thus, we have developed a desire to imitate more literate traders. They invented religion for us, the "Greek" and "Latin" languages, and unified the basic "degrees of kinship" in religious understanding. And we, a little confused because of the clumsiness of our language in the "foreign" articulation, adopted them a little askew, each nation - in its own direction, in general - at all 360 degrees. The native mu-mu, that is, mama, has remained unchanged for everyone. And there is no need for any "conquests" and profound theories about the "Indo-European family of languages".

I have already considered numerals in the previous section, but I cannot ignore the fact that "specialists in Indo-European languages" talk about "numerals from two to six, sometimes up to nine", and the aforementioned authors "expand" linguists. So.

| | |
|---|---|
| перст (finger – Tr.) (один палец (one finger – Tr.), when counting on fingers) | first (English): P -> F; der erste "the first" (German) |
| два, две, двое | two (English), zwo, zwei, zween (German), deux (French) |
| оба, обе; оба – два (colloquial) | both (English), beide (German) |

| | |
|---|---|
| три, трое | three, three (English), drei (German), trois (French) |
| шесть | six (English, French): sh — s; sechs (German) |
| семь (седмь) | even (English), sieben (German), sept “seven”, septieme “seventh” (French) |
| тысяча | thousand (English), Tausend (German) |

It is not for nothing that linguists begin "common" numerals with two. Unlike the authors mentioned, they know very well that the Russian word "перст" (female breast), although ancient, is completely alien to the Russian language, just like "перси" (female breast), which has become in our country "наперсник" (confidant), a man pressed to the chest in the best feelings. Most likely, we adopted this word when selling our girls on the Volga, when buyers, bargaining, tested the elasticity of their breasts with their finger, saying: and now we will try the quality of the "перси" (female breasts) of your goods, and pressed with their finger. We confused "our" перси (female breasts) with "their" finger, calling it "перст" (probe). When we realized that we were mistaken, it was too late, people were used to it. Percy has also ceased to be applied to the chest, with the exception of the connection “persi – languor”, leaving the naperstnik (confidant) with the “job title” in the “chest” sense, but also the thimble – not forgetting, worn on the finger, and the ring, also related to the finger.

A thousand is even funnier. The thing is that the Russians did not have a count of more than forty, then there was darkness. The maximum was a dozen dozens and forty forties, and if you needed more, then there was “darkness of darkness”, in today’s terms – infinity. It was not for nothing that I burst out laughing when I read in dictionaries about the “interpretation” of darkness into a finite number. Some say it is a thousand, others – ten thousand. This dispute has not yet been resolved. I understand the “logic” of the latter. How is that possible, they reason, forty forties is one thousand six hundred, why do we need a double notation, let's start with ten thousand. The first ones didn't know how many forty forties would be. And both of them had no idea that counting couldn't be invented straight away from "infinity", without intermediate values. Besides, we had a twelve-digit count, by dozens, and the decimal one came to us together with a thousand. Actually, I don't know where it came from? Maybe even from England. Although, more likely, from Germany or Holland, when Peter went there on a business trip.

There's no hint of our "conquest" of Europe here. For variety, I'll just add modern counting in Italian: uno, due, tre, quattro, cinque, say, setten, otto, nove, diechi. Are the English one, two, three similar to the Italian uno, due, tre? Unless, of course, you don’t say three in English, but write three?

I’ll move on to pronouns, because they’ve been waiting for a long time.

| | |
|---|---|
| мой | my (English), mein (German), mien (French) |
| твой | dein (German), tien (French) |
| свой, его | sein (German), sien (French) |

| | |
|---|---|
| мне, меня | me (English), mich, mir (German), me, moi (French) |
| себе, себя | dich, dir (German), te, toi (French) |
| ему | ihm (German) |
| (у) нас | (bei) uns (German), nous “we” (French) |
| те (in the demonstrative sense) | they, the (def. article) (English), die (German def. article “these') |
| тем (in the demonstrative sense) | them (English), dem (German def. article “them') |
| ты | thou (English obsolete), du (German), tu (French) |
| не, нет, ни | no (English), nicht “not”, nein “no” (German), ne “not”, nul “not one”, non “no” (French) |
| сколь(ко) | quel “which” (French) |

I don’t even know where to begin. There’s so much here. After all, linguists said that in the “Indo-European family” only the personal pronouns of the first and second persons agree, in short: me and you. Nothing else agrees, it’s been checked as many times as the “Indo-European family” itself has existed. And it “began”, as we know, with Sanskrit. But in order to prove that the Russians conquered the whole world in the 13th century, we would have to leave about half of our vocabulary there. In spite of the current “brokers” — the breakers who, having lived there, returned to us again along with distributors and refrigerators. It got to the point that the word “сколько” (how much) has been added to the pronouns, replacing the word “как” (how) according to Dahl, and used, for example, in questions like “how much”, “how far”, “how to get there?” And even then, no examples were found except for the French quel. I’ll give you a hint: in Italian “quanto costa” = “how much does it cost”. Ah, quanto is not suitable for "сколько"? Well, what does it have to do with me? The Italian quanto is almost the French quel, they "live" next to each other there, "communicate" more often, and have completely forgotten about their "relatives" - сколько. And why did the particles "не" and "ни" end up in pronouns? And the negation "нет"? Have you noticed that in Italian "но" is also no. And here we sometimes say "но-но-но, watch out!" when they want to scare, without knowing what. Haven't you heard? And the Italian "stars" very often sing: no, no-o, no-o-o, like, never and under no circumstances. I wonder if they brought us this when they came for our larch for the piles for the Venetian palaces? And not during our "conquest of them" with wooden clubs.

The two-variant comparison of “нас” and “у нас” in one package” looks especially shameless, in order to please two languages at once: German and French. The authors, however, rightly think: “у нас” we will compare with the German “uns”, and “us” – with the French “nous”, and it’s in the bag – the number of words left to Europe during the Russian “conquest” will grow even more. They didn’t know that there would be such a fool as me. In German, uns really means нас, нам (us), but wir also means the same thing – мы (we). The fact is that in Russian and German, the usage of this pronoun does not coincide. Therefore, the

authors chose uns not because it strictly corresponds to the translation, but because it sounds more consonant. And for exactly the same reason, they did not compare the Russian “мы” with the German wir. You must admit, мы and “wir” have nothing in common. Almost as shameless is the comparison of "мне", "меня" with English, German and French words, because they do not even come close to the sound "n". The only thing they have in common is that they are all monosyllabic and all begin with "m". You can also compare, for example, зуб (a tooth) and зоб (a crop), мясо (meat) and молоко (milk), трубку (a pipe) and тряпку (a rag).

Of course, I am not arguing about the pronouns "my" and "your", "I" and "you". These are "trade" words and they should be almost the same for everyone. But I have already written about this. I will note that the authors stopped comparing the "cores" of the dictionaries at this point. They tried their best to make Sanskrit linguists gasp, saying, how come we didn't notice that the "cores" are so heavy, almost like cannons. Pleased with themselves, the authors moved into a new battle, this time for the remains of the dictionary, which officially includes, if you still remember, 98-99 percent of words that do not belong to the "cores", and therefore are ready to change at least every week. I do not know how the Russian word "au"! that is, "where are you?" and the French ou - where? managed to stay in the dictionaries for so many years. The main thing is that Nosovsky and Fomenko started combing through four dictionaries outside their "cores" with it. I also don’t know if I have the patience to analyze their entire table. After all, it’s easier for them, they wrote several words in a row that are completely different from each other and said about them all at once that they are the spitting image, like twins, and that’s it. But I have to show on paper, and for each word separately, that they are similar like a fork to a bottle, or the old Russian letter “хер” (a dick – Tr.) to a finger. Moreover, I have to delve into the “subtleties” that the “Ed”. describes for them in the following way: “For readers who don’t know German and (or) French, we inform you that the German – en and the French – er or – ir in verbs are infinitive form markers, similar to the Russian – ать or – еть, etc., therefore, they usually should not be taken into account in comparisons”. I inform "Ed”., and along with it the authors, that I will not take into account not only -er and -ir in verbs, but also -t in French surnames, if I come across them. I clearly remember that the French sculptor Falcone, who sculpted Peter, was incorrectly called Falconet in old books. This was, of course, before we learned to call the actress Brigitte Bardo (Bardot) without the idiotic prefix that for some reason is added to all French surnames. Oh, and I forgot one more thing. The authors combed through the dictionaries strictly alphabetically, and that's how they got into their table, strictly like soldiers - by height. So, if I don't have enough patience, you'll see for yourself which letter I stopped at. Note that I've already looked at "ay". I just want to add that I was born and lived most of my life in Siberia, including many years in the taiga, and I have never heard anyone shout "ay". E-ge-gey, o-go-go, e-ey, I have heard, au-u - never. Maybe this au is the same story as "goy yesi"?

I'll move on to quoting the table for the letter "б":

| | |
|---|---|
| белый | blanc “white”, belle “beautiful” (French); cf. in Russian. white in the sense of “good, clean': белое тело (white body – Tr.), белый свет (white light – Tr.), белые руки (white hands – Tr.) |
| берег, брег “steep shore' | Berg “mountain” (German), berge “(steep) shore” (French) |

| | |
|---|---|
| бить | beat (English) |
| бледный | bleme (French) |
| блеять | to bleat (English), bloken (German) |
| блакитний “blue' | blue (English), blau (German), bleu (French) (Ukrainian) |
| борода (брада) | beard (English), Bart (German), barbe (French) |
| борт | board (English), Bord (German), bord (French) |
| брод | ford (English): B —> F |
| бродить, бродильное | bread (English), Brot “bread” (German) production |
| броня, оборона | Brunne (German) |
| будка “little house; retail outlet' | Bude “little house”, Budike “(small) shop” (German), boutique “small store” (French) |
| бук | beech (English), Buche (German) |
| букашка | bug “beetle” (English) |
| Бульба “potato” (Ukrainian, Belarusian) | Bolle “(large) onion” (German dialect), bulbe “onion, dome” (French) |
| бык | boeuf (French): F —> K |

Regarding the words белый, бледный, блеять, блакитный and a number of others not mentioned in the table, I have already conducted my own investigation, which resulted in a "double bubble", that is, the Bible. In my opinion, such research should be conducted not alphabetically, but by the meaning and root of the word. You be the judge of the results. The bank, especially steep, is best defined by the Tatar word yar, but then berg - a mountain will be like a dog's fifth leg. If you pay attention to the forced "transition" in the right part of the table B in F, F in K, (P in F, the table is above) or in any other letters that you want, the Russian бить can be "identified" not only with the English beat "bi-t", but also with meat (mi-t) - мясо. After all, there is no German or French "confirmation" in the right part of the table. The word "борт" in the English-German-French sense has never existed in the Russian language, it came to us together with "botik" (of Peter), which also had a small bortik. If you don't believe me, ask Dahl. Although, to be honest, "борт" used to exist in the Russian language, but today it has been completely forgotten, only one word remains from it – botnichestvo, that is, beekeeping. So, this Russian "борт" is a hollow tree, a hollow stump, a hollow in which bees live. Then - a log for bees, a hollowed stump, a single-tree hive - already made by man according to the type of a naturally rotten stump. Well, and what does this "борт" have to do with a ship's

board, especially a foreign one? It's embarrassing to cheat like a child, you're not playing a game of cards with your wife in the evening.

Of course, I am not a great connoisseur of English, but I still feel that ford, that is, a брод, is not quite an independent word. And it did not come from a sudden inspiration during the urgent need to call the crossing of a river on foot a new word. For force is not only translated as strength and violence, but also - to compel, to force, that is, simply - to drive into a river, to push into the water, to make to dive (marine). Therefore, there is nothing surprising in the fact that from force came ford, as a forced need to stomp on foot in the water instead of swimming. I studied Russian longer, so without hesitation in the place of the authors of the table, I would have squeezed the words брод, бродить, бродильное into one line instead of two. And I would not have picked consonant words for them in different, so to speak, concepts: to wander on the water and to bake bread. Generally speaking, бродить in Russian means to walk in different directions, to wander, to walk, pushing something apart with your feet, but also a spontaneous boiling, self-mixing of a liquid or such a viscous substance as dough. In Dahl, there are thirty words from the word бродить, including бродить рыбу (to wander fish – Tr.). By the way, about fish. Authors are so eager to find more words from foreigners, which we supposedly left them after our conquest, that, as they say, in a lack of fish, even a crayfish is a fish. Бук, букашка, бульба и бык are generally unworthy of consideration in the same company because of the indescribable immorality, similar to forced cohabitation. There are about fifty beech trees throughout Russia, it is too cold for them here. Букашка (a bug – Tr.) is similar to чеплашка, which no one will ever translate into a foreign language. Бульба is more like a nose than a potato, and in no way a “large onion”. And even a “trembling doe” can be used as an analogy to a bull, especially with such a shameless alternation of letters as in the right part of the table.

Moving on to words starting with the letter "в".

| | |
|---|---|
| вал | wall (English), Wall “shaft, embankment” (German) |
| варить | warm “warm, hot” (English, German) |
| ведать, весть | wissen “to know” (German) |
| вертеть | invert “to turn over” (English), verser “to capsize” (French) |
| ветер | weather (English), Wetter “weather”, Gewitter “thunderstorm” (German) |
| вещий | wise (English), weise “wise” (German) |
| видно (from «видеть») | window (through which one can see) (English) |
| вино | wine (English), Wein (German), vin (French) |
| вирши “стихи' | verse (English), Vers (German), vers (French) |
| вить | wind “to curl” (English), winden “wind, wrap” (German) |
| вода | water, wade “ford”, wet (English), Wasser “water”, waten “ford” (German) |

| | |
|---|---|
| воин, вой (obsolete) | boy (English) |
| вол | bull (English), Bulle “bull” (German) |
| волк | wolf (English), Wulf (German) |
| воля | will (English), Wille (German), vouloir (French) |
| вопить | weep “cry” (English) |
| воск | wax (English), Wachs (German) |
| врать | write “write, compose” (English) |
| (в)тыкать | tuck “shove” (English) |
| выловить | waylay “lay in wait” (English) |

I have added to the table above a completely different attitude than to the previous ones, and this must be said directly, without delay. Indeed, there is a clear kinship in these words. One only has to think about how it was formed? That it was not as a result of a war of conquest by the Russians, that is for sure, since it would be necessary to recognize wars of conquest between the English, French and Germans, and not only the Russians against them, all together. Then we would find ourselves in a vicious circle, and it would be impossible to establish who conquered whom. A coincidence cannot be used here either. There are enough words to reject this version. More general reasons here may be trade and writing separately and both of these reasons simultaneously. But the word water, which should be a primordial folk word, having arisen even before trade and writing appeared in these specific places, gets in the way. It seems that we should start with this word, try to find an original replacement for it.

V. Dahl reports: “влага is a liquid in general, phlegm, dampness; water, moisture, oily liquid, fat, butter”. Then follow влажный, влажность, влажить, that is, to moisten, to saturate with water. If the word влага is basically water, then there must be other derivative words from влага, very ancient ones. Let’s see. “Влагать, вложить – вкладывать, вмещать. Влагание, вложение, вложка, влега, влагатель, влагательница (derivative words from “влага” – Tr.) do not require explanation. But it should be borne in mind that after the appearance of the new word вода (water – Tr.), влага took on a slightly different meaning, skewed in interpretation: instead of water, something less fluid is put in, even not fluid at all. For example, the vagina simply became a receptacle. The only words that remind us of water-moisture are влегать and влечь, especially влега and влог, which are a hollow, a sunkenness, a ravine, an outline, where moisture accumulates or flows.

Then the word владеть, власть, влазить, влачить – влечь (to possess, to rule, to intrude, to drag – to pull – Tr.), that is, волочить (to drag – Tr.) becomes clear. And even вляпаться (to plunge – Tr.). And even влюбить, влюбление is the action of making someone fall in love, dragging them into love. I will not copy in detail from Dahl all these and more than a dozen more words with the root "vl", right up to властолюбие (lust for power – Tr.). For me, it is already certain that the original word for вода was влага, since власть

(power, authority – Tr.) no longer coexists with any other words. And it is impossible to come up with such an abstract concept as власть just like that, "to pull out of thin air". It must first be identified with something more understandable and close in nature. And ownership of water, a waterway, a pool of a certain flowing "water" - this is power. I would advise the more cautious to turn directly to Dahl.

Why was влага or "вла" replaced by вода, leaving behind only power and its derivatives? Some light on this question can be shed by the city of Vologda, undoubtedly originating from волога - "oily liquid, fat, butter". Here Dahl, in my opinion, is not quite right in the semantics of this word, or rather half right. Generally speaking, greasy slippery mud is an excellent basis for dragging, dragging something, friction is greatly reduced. Therefore, this mud, specially maintained on the drag, then forgotten, grew into "oily liquid, fat and just butter" in the concepts of people who abandoned this trade. Dahl learned about this, but did not learn the original basis of this "oil", he simply had no one to tell about it in the middle of the 19th century, when steam locomotives were already in Rus'.

Meanwhile, I have already reported that the Italians from Venice, who were the first in the world to need larch piles to build their palaces on the viscous muddy bottom of the lagoon, reached not only Volok Lamsky, not only Vologda, but even Pechora and the Trans-Urals in search of this "shortage" of the 15th-16th centuries. But these were not simple Italians, but specifically Venetians, who were basically "Greeks" from Byzantium, they are also Jews, brought by Moses to the promised land to establish a world customs office there. (Details in other works). When the flow of salt through the Bosphorus subsided, and the slave trade in Kafa had not yet begun, part of the trading tribe poured into Europe, mainly to where it was warmer, to Venice, Genoa, Florence. Here, from the remains of Hebrew, "Greek" and local Italian, they "formed" classical Latin - a written language that no one spoke, but only prayed to Christ and occasionally wrote. This Latin went on a spree throughout Europe. It came to us, as I have already said, when traders organized the export of larch, leaving Catholicism in Kostroma, Yaroslavl, Vologda and further to the Urals provinces in exchange. Along with Catholicism, some non-trade words, such as врать-писать (to lie-to write) вирши (verses), ветер-погода (wind-wether), волк-вольф (wolf). But the main words are still trade words or indirectly providing for trade, its technology: вода (water), ведать (to know), вертеть (бревно) (turning (a log)), ветер-погода (wind-weather) as conditions for trade, вино (wine) as payment, вол (ox) for hauling, and so on. They noticed that in the West there is also an ox, but without a drag, they have invented the wheel. Soon, I know, the word crew will come to us. (all translations in brackets are the translator's)

I was about to stop examining the table, and then I thought, let me look at the letter "г" one more time, and then I'll give up. So, the letter "г".

| | |
|---|---|
| гладкий | glade, glide “to slide” (English), glatt “smooth” (German) |
| глотать | gloat “to devour with the eyes” (English) |
| гусь | goose (English), Gans (German) |
| грабли | rable “poker, scraper” (French) |
| грань, граница | Grenze (German) coffin, to bury Grab “grave” (German) |
| грязь | Gras “grass”, grau “gray” (German), gras “fat, greasy, viscous”, gris “gray” (French) |

Oddly enough, I liked the word грязь (dirt) and гладкая поляна (smooth glade) the most. Dirt almost literally interprets portage, especially in French, in the sense of greasy, fat, I would also add - worn out, streaked mud. And a glade is the very place for a portage, not to build it on windfall. Грабли (a rable) is also good. It is not for nothing that the verb грабить (to rob) comes from them, and there is no original Russian word for this action. I will leave грань (edge), a coffin and граница (a border) without comment, I do not have enough imagination. (all translations in brackets are the translator's)

I will have to continue. Letter "д":

| | |
|---|---|
| дарить, доверять | douer “to bestow, to bestow” (French) |
| дать, данный | donner “to give”, dot “dowry” (French) |
| дах “roof” (Ukrainian) | deck “roof of a carriage” (English), Dach “roof” (German) |
| день | day (English), — di (French ending of names of days of the week: lundi “Monday = day of the Moon”, mardi “Tuesday = day of Mars”, etc.) |
| дерево (древо); дрова; здоровый («крепкий, как дерево», that is "strong as a tree") | tree, true “faithful” (English), Teer “resin”, treu “faithful” (German) |
| дивный | divin “divine, divine” (French) |
| (не)доля | douleur “pain, grief” (French) |
| дом, домина | dome “vault” (English), Dom “cathedral” (German), domaine “estate, estate”, dome “cathedral; dome, vault” (French) |
| досадный | sadness (English) |
| доска | desk “table” (English) |
| дремать | dream (English), Traum “dream” (German), dormir “sleep” (French) |
| дрянь | truand “tramp, beggar” (French) |
| дума, думать | think “to think” (English), denken “to think” (German) |
| дым | fumee (French) |

I would not take the words I have highlighted into account either the "movements" there during our "conquest" or from there during their cultural conquest of us. In my opinion, they are given for the sake of counting, to intimidate with their abundance. I leave дах "roof" with some doubt as being of little importance, almost zero. But I can also add the Milan Cathedral, called the Duomo, to дом (a house), and especially since we had enough of our own words: хата (a hut), изба (log cabin), and дом is still a large structure, not like a smoky log cabin. We also did not make boards before the English, we made do with splits, that is, we split the tree in half. And we had both in half. Therefore, the board did not hinder us, and we acquired a sawmill, a rip saw, and a single-cut saw when we began sawing boards. A hump is a semicircular remnant from boards, while a rip cut and a single cut are the same as a split, but obtained not by splitting in half, but by cutting in half or with a single rip cut. Дрёма (slumber) could also have been brought to us when a foreign boss would shout at Russian workers every now and then, like, why are you always dreaming and dreaming, you have to work. (all translations in brackets are the translator's).

I can handle еда (food) and елей (fir, chrism or simply oil) without a table: еда, есть, едать means to eat (English), essen “to eat” (German); елей, олифа, олия “oil” (Ukrainian) – oil (English), ol (German). Of course, we didn't invent it ourselves, however, and neither did the French, Germans and English. We should look in "Sanskrit", it is Jewish, they were the ones who started using chrism. But for the letter "ж" I will give the table again. (all translations in brackets are the translator's).

| | |
|---|---|
| жевать, чавкать | to chew (English), gaver “to fatten up, to stuff” (French) |
| желудь (желодь) | gland “acorn” (French) |
| жердь | girder “beam, crossbar” (English) |
| жить | gite “dwelling” (French) |
| жрать, жор | gorge “to eat” (English), “throat” (French) |

As you can see, I have highlighted all the words here so as not to take them into account as transit words. Чавкать (to chump), in my opinion, any people would come up with it right away and without any borrowing, and as for жердь (a perch) I will give you an example from a school dictionary: gird - to gird, girdle - belt and to gird. Girder is indeed a beam and a truss, but with a note: technical. So, while there was no technology, this word was absolutely unnecessary not only for us, but also for the English. Moreover, you know how to pronounce жердь (zherd`), and girder is pronounced approximately as "geede", it really doesn't sound like a жердь, does it? Gorge can be translated from English as жрать (to devour), жадно глотать (to swallow greedily), but it is pronounced approximately as "godzh". Or do you think no one will check? What is written with a pen cannot be cut out with an axe, right? (all translations in brackets are the translator's).

The chain of words: "зиять, зеница “pupil”, зырить “to look' means to see (English), sehen “to see” (German)" can be immediately and without regret thrown into the basket. The same with the chain: "игла (a needle) Igel “hedgehog” (German), aiguille “needle” (French)". And with the chain "инде (Old Russian

“somewhere') – index “index, where to look for what” (English, French), Index (German)" this should definitely be done, since this word comes from the index finger, which in our country, if you remember, is перст. The chain: "имя (имена), именовать – name: reverse reading (English), Name (German), nom (French)" – also there, in the basket. (all translations in brackets are the translator's).

I'll go back to the table, otherwise your eyes will get blurry:

| | |
|---|---|
| карась | crucian (English), Karausche (German) |
| келья | cell “cage, cell” (English), Keller “basement”, Zeile “cell, cage” (German), cellier “basement” (French) |
| клей, глина | glue “glue, to glue” (English), kleben “to glue”, Klei “clay” (German) |
| клок | accros “(torn) tuft” (French): L —> R |
| ключ | cle, clef (French) |
| кобыла | cheval “horse” (French), hence chevalier “rider, knight, cavalier” |
| ковер | cover “to cover” (English), couvrir “to cover”, chevreau “goat kid; chevroil (type of leather)” (French) |
| коза | cheese (English), Kase “cheese” (German) |
| конопля | hemp, cannabic (English), Ham “hemp” (German) |
| кора | cor “horn; corn”, corce “bark, peel, rind” (French) |
| корабль | bark (English), Barke, Bark “bark” (German), barque “boat” (French) |
| кормить | cram “to stuff” (English) |
| кот, котяра (colloquial) | cat (English), Katze “cat”, Kater “cat” (German), chat “cat”, chatte “cat” (French) |
| крик | cry “to cry”, crow “to crow” (English), krahen “to crow” (German), cri “cry” (French) |
| кружка | Krug “mug”, Kruke “jug” (German) |
| крупа | croup “groats” (English), Graupe “pearl barley” (German), gruau “groats” (French) |
| куцый | cut “cut off” (English), couteau “knife, cutter” (French) |

That's it, my patience has snapped. From the last table I'll take only the крик, кружка and крупа (cry, the mug, and the groats – Tr.). And that's because the Russians never had mugs, they drank from a birch bark ladle, they didn't make groats, they ate the grain whole, without breaking it into groats, and the cry is very similar to the French "cock-a-doodle-doo", our roosters can't do that. The rest - in the basket.

But we must stop and dwell on the foreign words I've adopted, and on why Nosovsky and Fomenko are so strenuously trying to be considered... well, not quite adequate, or something? As an answer to the second question, I can only assume that someone told them that if they, such and such, don't prove that the Russians conquered the whole world, albeit in the distant past, then they won't see any circulation. In other respects, they are quite adequate, and I am very grateful to them for those conclusions in which they do not touch upon the issues of a “new interpretation of history”, but simply shorten its chronology, separate the all-too-big” Ivan the Terrible into its component parts, put the Battle of Kulikovo in its rightful place, and much more, which I was sincerely glad about. I will not hide the fact that without their research I would never have gotten to the Cossack robbers and much more.

So, the words “adopted” by me, related in many languages of the Christian world, became related for three reasons. Firstly, words with roots that are related even among animals. I have given examples above. Secondly, words related to trade, for trade, together with the Jews, was the first to permeate all peoples. Of these primary words, not many remnants remain in today's dictionaries; peoples have greatly altered them to fit the articulation of their anatomical language. But it should be noted that trade went hand in hand with Hebrew writing, which later became Greek and Latin. Writing fixed words in their writing, but not in their pronunciation. Thirdly, Christianity left the greatest mark on languages, which was also carried out first in Hebrew, then in Greek and Latin. Book printing most radically fixed the uniformity of commonly used words. Fifthly, no conquests with weapons in hand had and could have had any influence whatsoever on the formation of identical words in different languages. Language does not like coercion and training like a dog, it is like a cat on its own. It is trained out of love, not under duress. Therefore, language does only what it needs itself to do. It can only be "seduced".

I would like to finish this section by analyzing another opus by the aforementioned authors: "Of course, such a number of coincidences between the basic, primary words of Russian and Western European languages can hardly be considered accidental. A natural question arises: who borrowed words from whom? Or: which language came from which? Did the word ПЬЕДЕСТАЛ (PEDESTAL) come from the Russian words ПЯТА (PEDE) and СТОЛ (STAL)? Or, on the contrary, were the two ancient Russian words ПЯТА and СТОЛ obtained by splitting the mysterious overseas word PEDESTAIL that came to Rus'? In our opinion, in this case, as in many others (of course, we have not listed everything (and I have shortened it)) there is a borrowing FROM THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE. <…> In conclusion, let us dwell on the word OK (OC), which gave the name to the Occitan language. Today, the word OC is translated as “yes”, i.e. an AFFIRMATION interjection. Is this where the Anglo-American OK (okay) comes from, which has the same meaning: “yes, everything is fine, good”? The fact that in Occitan the word OK (OC) meant "YES" is very interesting. It is probably a slight modification of the Slavic affirmative word ТАК. Another form of it, "ага", has survived in Rus”, and is considered only colloquial today. The words АГА (or АКА) and ОК are practically identical”.

Well, guys, you can't expose yourself like that, you'll be taken for completely brainless, or completely shameless. Just look at what you're talking about? The word pedestal was not used in ancient times, otherwise it would have definitely made it into the Dictionary of Antiquity. For the sake of "completeness", in the sense of the thickness of the dictionary, words that are not even ancient, such as alimony, astronomy,

potter, tree, household, utensils, and so on, were included there. And even class struggle. So pedestal wouldn't have been missed, it's a beautiful word.

You translated pedestal into English, in French it is written almost the same way, piedestal, which is why we have it with a soft sign, but in German it is written completely differently – den sockel. However, I give the aforementioned “linguists” a reason to use the word “сокол” (a hawk – Tr.) here. Why did we keep our word in England and France, but in Germany we didn’t want to keep it? Let’s take the Russian “пята” (a heel – Tr.), which you also wrote in Latin – pede. Don’t you know that this is a heel, which is why we say to back away, to go forward with our heels? Of course, our body rests mainly on our heels, which is why we came up with the phrase “пята свода”, that is, those parts of the vault with which it rests on the walls or columns. And the word свод (a vault – Tr) itself is purely Russian, it comes from the word сводить кладку (to bring the masonry – Tr.) from two points to one point – the keystone of the vault.

Let’s move on to стол (a table – Tr.). This is the word that we got from somewhere far away, and quite recently by historical standards. Why do I think so? Because as soon as we had a table, we immediately started making derivative words from it, considering it to be the root: столовый, стольный, столец, столешница, and even стольник and столяр (a carpenter – Tr.), and finally we got to столоверчение. Let's turn to foreigners. In English, there are two tables: a dining table - table and a writing table - desk, that is, simply a board. The Germans have everything mixed up: tisch is, firstly, a table, and secondly, food or lunch, but kost is also a table, and also food, although tischier is still a carpenter. Some light is shed on this circumstance by the English stool, that is, a chair without a back, which is also familiar to all plumbers as a toilet seat or stool (medical), that is, what is taken for analysis in the laboratory. In Russian: shit. So, this табурет is written in English as stool, that is, "table", but is read as "chair". But in English we even read Newton as "Nevton", and not Newton. Read Lomonosov at least in the place where he prophesies that "the Russian land can give birth to its own Platos and quick-witted **Nevtons**".

Let's apply pure logic in this regard. What is the difference between a stool and a table? Structurally - nothing, only in size, height. Now, where did we get the word "chair", that is, a stool with a back, when in English "chair" is read, roughly speaking, - "тшэе"? This same pure logic cannot but lead to the following conclusion. As soon as we met the English on the Baltic and the White Sea, we made two of their words from one of theirs: стол (a table – Tr.) and стул (a chair – Tr.). Before that, we generally sat on low logs, and put the endova on a high log. That is why we have formed such an awkward root - "стол", which we have used entirely for further word formation, which I mentioned above. But not everything is so simple with our table. Even Vladimir Dal got confused. I will not describe in detail, since this does not apply to my criticism, I will only say that столица (a capital – Tr.) did not come from стол, but from “столп” (a pillar – Tr.), and it comes from the word “сто” (hundred – Tr.), now completely forgotten, which has already become in Dal a simple saying like "goy yesi". Perhaps, I will consider this issue in another place, if the opportunity arises.

As for "okay", the criticized authors have piled up even more nonsense. Just take another look at the quote. What's not there? Right down to "Occitan language" and Russian "ага". This is an incomprehensible farfetched idea. Meanwhile, a completely logical explanation has slipped into print, although I would modify it somewhat. The fact is that a certain Aldridge Casey (I can't vouch for the accuracy, I read it a long time ago) worked at some automobile plant, he served as a senior inspector, in our language the head of the OTK - the technical control department. He meticulously checked the quality and wrote his abbreviated name on the hood with chalk: O.K., supposedly, checked and fit for sale. This abbreviation was read, naturally, in English, and came out as: "ou kay", then it spread to people who spoke English poorly, and they came out

with "o'kay". But there is one snag in this explanation, for example, Smith Wessons or Franklin Roosevelts would not write "O.K". They would write "S.V". and F.R".

Without thinking twice, I looked in the school dictionary. The word keeper is translated as a guardian, an orderly in a mental hospital, a keeper, an owner. If I had a thicker dictionary, I would definitely have found something else in it, like "responsible for the affairs of psychos on behalf of the owner". Now I only have to translate the English word old not only as old, but also as "senior", and even more so as "expert", and a completely nameless abbreviation will form: "expert, responsible for the affairs of the psychos on the conveyor on behalf of the owner". The abbreviation will also be "O.K". The beauty is that the heads of the quality control department with any last name and first name can mark their work with such letters.

Something about the "lingam" and Russian swearing

**V.N. Demin in his book "Riddles of the Urals and Siberia" ("Veche", Moscow, 2001). (All his book titles include the word "riddle" or "great secret") discusses the giant people who once lived on Earth, and gives examples. Here is one of them: "Cyclopean drawings are also common in the European North. Thus, in the British Isles, one of the most famous and popular monuments in the world is a giant primitive figure with an erect phallus, carved in tuff on a chalk hillside. However, photographs of it and even drawings are published extremely rarely, since they are considered "indecent (Fig. 95)"**.

An erect phallus - I know what it is, so I was not particularly interested in the drawing, especially since it is really primitive, but the caption under the drawing is rather strange, linguistically: "A giant with an erect lingam (emphasis is mine), carved on a rock. Seri Abbas, Dorset County, England". In all likelihood, Demin simply copied the caption in the source from which he took the drawing into his book. In the text, he expresses himself in a word that is more understandable to me.

I am a fan of such words, for the additional meaning of which you can dig in dictionaries. And such curiosity has served me well more than once in finding historical facts that traditional historians carefully hide from us, as if it were the secret of the atomic bomb. So, I got down to business. I leafed through all the dictionaries available, including the Great Soviet Encyclopedia and the Dictionary of Antiquity. In vain. There are no lingams. Moreover, there is nothing even close, excluding some tribe in the Congo River region. Great Soviet Encyclopedia: "Lingala, Ngala, a language spoken in the Republic of Zaire, on the northern and southern banks of the Congo River. Belongs to the central group of the Congo zone of the Bantu language family". "...There is a well-known theory of the English ethnographer G. Johnson, who assumed that the ancestors of the Bantu penetrated into Central Africa from Sudan". But the editorial board of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia is decisively against this. They say that the facial features of Bantu speakers do not allow this in any way. And do the facial features of the Russians and Britons allow them to have the same words that I spoke about in the previous sections of this article? And the English and the Tatars? The Germans and the Tatars? So why the hell do all these peoples have so many similarities in their languages, and not in "Newspeak", but in an old dictionary? I didn't look at Newspeak. I looked at the words to copulate, sexual organ and "Double bubble" - the most ancient.

It became more interesting to me. Especially since, according to my theory, Islam was brought to Africa by a trading tribe, first to Ethiopia, then splitting into Egypt and Central Africa. I wrote about this in more detail in my work "The Mystery of the Arabian Peninsula". Islam was created by the Jews specifically for non-Jewish peoples, through whom the Jews were filtered. I wrote about this in my work about Christ. Of course, Islam was a secondary gift from the Jews. Their primary gift was trade itself, the most difficult thing

in the world. Unless, of course, you want to go bankrupt in a month. And trade is impossible in principle without a more perfect and widespread unified trade language among the peoples participating in the trade. I also wrote about this in other works. But you can't get from Ethiopia to Central Africa without going through Sudan. And there is a lot of gold in Central Africa – this "universal equivalent", which was made into what it was by the Jews. So, according to the idiotic "Afro-Asiatic tree of languages" and its "Semitic-Hamitic branch", as well as the external appearance of the peoples, some commonly used words of the Bantu language could not have got to Central Africa from Sudan. But according to my theory, they got there exactly that way, despite the anthropological differences, which I do not deny at all.

So, thanks to the "lingam in an erect state" mentioned at the beginning of the section, thanks to the "Lingala" language, which ended up in Central Africa, thanks, finally, to the author of the caption to the picture with this very "erect lingam". If I had written "erect phallus" like Demin, another proof of my theory would have floated away from me. Of course, I bragged, I need to move on to "linguistics".

Linguistics - everyone knows, comes from the "Latin" word lingua - language, this is not the tongue as such, the anatomical one that children show, sticking it out, but - the second signal system. The tongue that children show is unknown to me in Latin. So, the Russians express these two concepts in one word, and the English have language - speech language, and the anatomical one - tongue. I thought that if in England the picture on the rock is drawn with this very lingam, then I better look at related words for linguage. I see: langy - languid, lifeless, languor, weakness, to take on a languid appearance, languor. But in the caption to the picture it is also written "erect", if this definition were not there, then this very lingam would be languid and lifeless, with a languid appearance. The Germans also express language in two ways: the anatomical language is zunge, and the speech language is sprache, that is, just to speak. But note, zunehmen – to increase, to grow fat, zunahme – addition, growth, increase, zunden – to ignite, to flare up. Doesn't this coincidence in two languages indicate something that should be investigated in detail? For example, consult the famous Webster's dictionary. After all, I use school dictionaries.

But this is not my task, let linguists think about all this and hint to historians that in ancient times man had two languages, purely anatomical: above and below. For me there is no doubt about it. For me it is more important to know how the root ling (the language of Lingala) galloped from Equatorial Africa to foggy Albion, turning into lingam and linguistics? Without traders this simply could not have happened. After all, as far as I know, neither Ethiopia, nor Aksum, nor Sudan, nor Ancient Egypt conquered England. But I know for sure that Scottish tartan skirts on men in Scotland, they were not the first to invent them. Long before them, in the empire of Aksum and Yemen, exactly the same tartan skirts were worn by representatives of the stronger sex from the trading tribe. Britannica will not let me lie, see for yourself.

I have no doubt that the shaky foundation I have drawn from school dictionaries will be immediately laughed at by traditional historians who have eaten their fill on the pharaohs, right down to the exact dates of birth of their children and the holiday menu for this occasion. But you can't hide an awl in a sack. There will be those who will study the facts I have indicated in detail and shut the mouths of the excellent students who have memorized all the dates for 6 thousand years that did not even exist in nature. As for me, I don't have much time left to live without this, and there are more important things to do.

In the previous sections, I have already shown using more statistical material that the basis of any language is largely made up of words derived from a root expressing sexual organs, copulation and the birth of children. And what else was there to talk about at that time when there was not even trade? I also gave

an example from modern Russian industrial production, when a good, very bright and understandable dialogue between workers of a pick and a shovel can be made up of just one word.

Only you need to have some prerequisites, whether the many defining words came from a local root, or from something brought in from outside? God Ярило and ярмарка (a fair – Tr.), in my opinion, came from Slavic sources, but as for the words derived from гой and изгой (an outcast – Tr.), this is undoubtedly a Jewish root. There are other foreign roots in the Russian language that have become swear words, so to speak, decent, not very swear words, or something. For example, in Persian, “yelda” and “manda” mean exactly the same thing as in Russian. But they sound much better in Russian lips than “хуй” (a dick – Tr.) and “пизда” (a vagina – Tr.), the semantics of which I will not go into. I’d rather focus on the purely psychological human property of swearing in a foreign language without a shadow of embarrassment. But not right away, but after the digression about elda and manda, adding here the word блядь, which the overwhelming majority of Russians consider to be a primordially Russian word.

In my other works, I examined in detail the "Arab-Persian" merchants on the Volga, Ibn Fadlan and Ibn Dastu, who turned out to be Khazar Jews, who in turn descended from Arab Jews, and even earlier - from a Yemeni trading tribe, real, indigenous Jews. Therefore, elda and manda are Jewish words that arrived to us together with the Jews - on boats. A very modest Russian monk, whose name is not even compatible with swearing, writes about one heretical opinion: "This whole saying is blyad”, not church reason”. And blyad' here is a delusion, in the sense of wandering, getting lost. And the fact that this word has stuck to Russian women of a certain behavior is the fault of our famous merchant Afanasy Nikitin, who wrote in his "Journey Beyond Three Seas": "All their wives are бляди (whores – Tr.)”. But he is not to blame either, he was simply surprised why in those southern regions women often change husbands? In Nikitin's homeland, this did not happen.

I'll have to come to his aid, because he didn't stay there long enough to get to the bottom of the problem. The thing is that in my book I described in detail the matriarchy, which, for example, ended in the south of Western Europe only with the publication of "Malleus", and in the East - a little earlier, when we stopped selling our women on the Volga due to falling demand. Ibn Fadlan was still buying them, probably just before the closure of this market. In general, matriarchy arose because the selfish southern men, unlike us, who had sex only in the summer, did this all year round, but did not care at all about women burdened with children. And women began to die out catastrophically. Those who survived established matriarchy and became very picky about men. That's when they received the status of блядь, that is, simply wandering from man to man. And, naturally, Nikitin did not like it, this thing did not fit into his Russian consciousness. Then, under matriarchy, the ratio of men and women equalized, the demand for Russian slaves on the Volga disappeared, the men quickly overthrew their matriarchs from the throne and established patriarchy, since they had more power. And in revenge for past humiliations, they introduced polygamy. Why we did not have matriarchy, read in the book, because there is not enough space here.

Using just one example of elda and manda, which fly off our tongue quite easily compared to their native synonyms, I hope I proved that swearing in a foreign language is much easier, conscience does not bother, embarrassment is barely noticeable. That is why every single foreigner who appears among us begins to swear in Russian, not having yet learned the words "здравствуйте" (hello – Tr.) and "спасибо" (thanks – Tr.). And here I must consider one aspect of the main question to which I have devoted all my works – the mysterious Russian soul.

Foreigners since ancient times have been baffled when they describe such a wide spread of Russian obscenities. J. Reitenfels (1670 – 73 in Moscow): “The Russians … almost reach the point of blasphemy, constantly using shameless expressions”. Olearius (1636 in Moscow): “…they use many shameful, vile words and mockeries, which I – if the historical narrative did not require it – would never communicate to chaste ears”, and gives a complete list of Russian obscenities. D. Fletcher (1588): “However, I will not even speak of the latter, because it is so dirty that it is difficult to find a decent expression for it”. One can continue, but it is clear that they cannot find any intelligible reason for this. You can also get to our days, in which foreigners have already reached a complete stupor regarding Russian swearing.

Meanwhile, they don’t even seem to know their own swear words, for example the English, I simply didn’t want to get to other nations. I’ll remind them: fuck means ебаться, cunt means пизда, cocksucher means хуесос, motherfucker means ебарь матери or in the Russian sense “ёб твою мать”. Is that enough? More than enough. Just one word from this set is enough to make up a full-fledged dialogue like the one I cited a little higher from the life of a Russian miner. And the full set, especially using the words motherfucker and cocksucher, can give you a rich palette of an analogue of Russian swearing, in all the variety of shades of “artistic” Russian swearing derived from it.

Another thing is that the English do not use these words without extreme necessity, for no reason, and without a break, they do not replace ordinary human speech with swearing. Here I should quote Vladimir Sorokin from his novel “Blue Lard”: “Swearing is an unconscious reaction of the Russian population to the three-headed serpent named “autocracy – Orthodoxy – community”. It is a verbal pagan rebellion of the Russian collective unconscious, a forbidden magical language that preserves pre-Christian sexual impulses, a centuries-old reaction to the suppression of individual eroticism by the Orthodox community. <…> A writer who does without swearing is equivalent to a pianist who cut off one of his fingers”. <…> It is simply a disgrace – hundreds of men live in dozens of great Russian novels, drink, fight, work, wage war – and not one of them, not once, swears!”

Everything in this phrase is utter nonsense, especially against the background of this nonsense the "three-headed serpent" wins. But the author himself, who wrote these words about the "three-headed serpent", does not understand their full depth. That is why he smeared them with further reasoning. That is why Sorokin makes the luminaries of the pen, intuitively, by their God-given talent, avoid swearing in their works, completely in vain include swearing in their immortal books.

First, I will ask the author, without putting it off for too long: Why, for example, do the English not intersperse their speech with swearing by 80 percent? Do they not have "individual eroticism"? Are Catholicism and Protestantism not native sisters of Orthodoxy? Do they not "suppress individual eroticism"? Of course, Orthodoxy is the most odious religion of all Christianity, and I have repeatedly proven this in my works. But it is not odious to the manifestation of individual eroticism, in this case all Christian varieties are like candies from a conveyor belt. Christianity is odious in relation to man in general, I will not dwell on this in detail due to lack of space, see my other works. But in relation to individual eroticism, Orthodoxy and Anglicanism are twin brothers. Why don't the English swear? They should swear too, according to Sorokin.

Secondly, why was it only the Russians who privatized the "verbal pagan rebellion", the "forbidden magical language that preserves pre-Christian sexual impulses", as if it were the famous Russian "nose on a wide base"? Why didn't the English do the same? According to Sorokin, they should have done the same,

and even earlier than the Russians. But they didn't do it. Although who will take away their "pre-Christian sexual impulses"?

That is why Sorokin does not understand his own words about the three-headed Serpent-Gorynych. I will have to explain. I could probably explain it myself, but it is better to give the floor to the Englishman D. Fletcher, right at the end of the 16th century (1588): “The common people are subjected to such robbery by the Tsar and such exactions from the nobles ... that ... many villages and towns, half a mile or a whole mile long, are completely empty, the people have all fled from the ill-treatment and violence. ... on the road to Moscow, between Vologda and Yaroslavl (a little more than a hundred English miles) there are at least fifty villages that are completely abandoned, so that there is not a single inhabitant in them. <…>The extreme oppression to which the poor common people are subjected deprives them of any courage to engage in their trades, for the more prosperous any of them is, the greater is the danger of losing not only their property, but their very lives”. "...how they are frightened when one of the boyars or nobles learns of the goods which they intend to sell. <…> That is why the people (although generally capable of enduring any labor) indulge in laziness and drunkenness, not caring about anything more than their daily food. <…> The law obliging everyone to remain in the same state and rank in which his ancestors lived is very well devised in order to keep subjects in slavery. And it is so consistent with this state that it does not contribute to the rooting of any virtue or any special or remarkable quality. No one can expect a reward or promotion to which he might aspire, or care about improving his condition, but, on the contrary, he will expose himself to greater danger the more he is distinguished by excellent or noble qualities”.

J. Ulfeld, ambassador (1578), ten years before Fletcher, traveled through Rus' and observed: “… the houses were completely ruined and unroofed, for nowhere in all of Russia did they see the owner, in all the places where we entered the courtyard, the houses were empty, and there were no people or cattle in them, so that I could hardly believe that there was a state not ruined by the enemy, which was brought into greater disorder than this state”.

If this explanation is not enough, then G. Kotoshikhin 76 years later (1664) adds: “… and the house, and the stomachs, and the estates will be taken by the tsar and sold to anyone who wants to buy. And if a merchant and a peasant builds in the most good manner, and they will impose more taxes on him every year”. Not enough? Here is A. Olearius (1634, 1636, 1643 in Moscow): “If we keep in mind that the general difference between lawful government and tyrannical government is that in the former the well-being of the subjects is observed, and in the latter the personal benefit of the sovereign, then Russian government should be considered to be closely related to tyrannical government”.

Still not enough? Then here is Yu. Krizhanich: “Because of the cannibalistic laws, all European nations unanimously call this glorious kingdom tyrannical. And, in addition, they say that the tyranny here is not ordinary, but the greatest. <…> And there is no doubt that if the Germans themselves or any other people had such a harsh government, then their morals would be the same as ours, and even worse. And it is not without reason that I say worse, for they surpass us in intelligence and cunning, and he, whose intelligence is sharper, can come up with more crimes and deceptions. Because of this, such vile morals have arisen among this people that other peoples consider Russians to be deceivers, traitors, merciless robbers and murderers, foul-mouthed and slobs. And where does this come from? Because every place is full of taverns, and monopolies, and prohibitions, and tax farmers, and kissers, and extortionists, and customs officers, and secret informers. So that people are everywhere and everywhere bound and cannot do anything of their own free will, and cannot freely use what they have acquired by their labor and sweat. But they must do

everything and trade secretly and silently, with fear and trembling, and deceit, and must hide from these numerous servants, and robbers, and villains, or, more accurately, executioners. And these kissers and tormentors of peasants (emphasis added), not receiving sufficient pay, cannot act fairly, but need forces them to seek self-interest and accept gifts from thieves".

I will interrupt the quote for a minute to tell you that Krizhanich is not only writing about his time, but also predicting our time, the year 2002? He describes all of our many police departments without exception.

"Thus, people, accustomed to doing everything secretly and like thieves, with fear and deceit, forget about any honor, lose their military courage and become rude, impolite and sloppy. They do not know how to value honor and do not know the difference between people, and from the very first words they usually ask every stranger: "Do you have a wife?" And the second question: "What royal salary do you receive, how much property do you have, are you rich?" They are not ashamed if they are seen naked in the bathhouse. And if they need someone's mercy, they themselves shame themselves vilely, and humiliate themselves, and beg, and beat their foreheads to the floor to the point of disgust. <…> Harsh rule is the reason that Rus' is sparsely populated. Twice as many people could live in Rus' as there are now, if the rule were softer".

To complete the set, I will also quote the words of T. Smith (1604), he also did not swear in English: "... living under such a government, these people are indifferent to the feelings of disunity and union, necessity and desire, hope and fear, so that they care least of all who governs them. Although in any other, more educated country they would be dealt with without difficulty. But here every subject can fear that his tongue will be cut out if he speaks everything, his ears will be cut off if he hears everything, and, finally, he will be deprived of life, if, having believed in anything, he decides to speak out in defense of his convictions".

Smith, 400 years before today, amazingly accurately predicted our current indifference in the elections of those "who govern us". But he is not Nostradamus? This only means that, by and large, nothing has changed in our country. I'm too lazy to even write about today, read Alexander Minkin about modern elections. In addition, remember the fate of NTV and TV-6. And although the ears are not cut today, it would be better if they were cut, because in comparison with the long, cruel, inhuman beatings by the "fighters" of all sorts of riot police, special forces and so on, which the newspapers never tire of writing about, this would be less painful.

I can't resist and remind you of our "wise" president, who with a completely unperturbed look says such banalities every day that you want to howl. And the "official listeners in the box" perceive them with such delight that you just want to spit, but you can't spit enough, you'll have to clean the screen yourself. And then I'll return to linguistics, interrupted at the most interesting place. So, the whole country sees how many homeless children are around, and thinks, not mine, although some hearts bleed. And then the "wise man" appears on the screen and draws our attention to this problem, and in our presence gives a "command" to his idiots, and those blockheads, in chorus: it will be done! As if without these words of the "wise man" they, the idiots, did not guess themselves that something had to be done. And the "wise man" himself would at least be embarrassed to say this from the "box" to us, his slaves, but would have called his idiots secretly, and would have barked in their ears so that sparks would fly from their eyes or their eardrums would burst. And we would have seen the consequences ourselves, only on the streets and train stations, and not on TV. And there was no need to stare on TV. Why is he staring? He takes us for fools. He is "PR-ing" before people without hope, but with fear. Before people who are indifferent to feelings of

disunity and unity, necessity and desire. In front of the people who care the least about the problem, who controls them?

Lord, is it really not clear? He is not doing this for you and me, this is directly intended for quoting and showing on the "boxes" of foreign mass media. And he did not even guess about it himself. It was Gleb Pavlovsky who asked him to pose. This "Judas on a buck" in silver coins knows us very well, and would not fuss for our sake.

Returning to "linguistics". I probably swore for half an hour, without a break or repetition of obscene opuses. I did not say a single one twice. But the "sovereign" appears on the screen every single day, and almost around the clock, with breaks of no more than three hours. And every single day he utters exactly the same banalities to us. Absolutely in all aspects of our lives, including pensions, which would be better left in the hands of the state, and not in the hands of those who could bring them down to the subsistence minimum. How can we break the habit of swearing?

I propose a very simple experiment. Choose the most foul-mouthed village from all of foul-mouthed Russia and record the current state of affairs with swearing on a tape recorder. And ask the West to arrange life in this village of ours for 20 years according to Western standards, including legislation, police and courts. They will do it, it will not cost them much. Nothing else needs to be changed, even the most notorious swearers left in place. And then, in twenty years, when the old foul-mouthed people die out and the younger generation grows up, let them turn on the tape recorder again. I bet my head that the tape recorder will record less swearing than in England. There will also be “side” effects: the residents of this experimental village will drink no more vodka than Scandinavia, the “heaviest drinker” in the West, and they will vote much smarter and more responsibly in elections for all branches of government.

One more "side" effect can be predicted. This is to try to give the 200 Russian peoples the opportunity to self-determine. But first, the most sober representatives of these peoples, even if they are foul-mouthed, should be taken to the aforementioned village on an excursion, and twice: at the beginning and end of the experiment.

That is why Sorokin's words in their pure form, without continuation: "Swearing is an unconscious reaction of the Russian population to the three-headed serpent named "autocracy - Orthodoxy - community", I liked so much.

Don't forget that the KGB colonel, who would have been kicked out of the "office" ten years ago like a naughty puppy for making the sign of the cross, even under his own blanket, has now stopped appearing on screen without the sign of the cross. That's what "Orthodoxy" is from the three-headed Serpent-Gorynych. About autocracy - enough from the 16th-17th centuries, it is exactly the same today. And about the "community" read in my other works. There is no space left for this here. And you can't tell it in a few words.

After Jesus

3.1. The Death of Jesus

The crucifixion of Christ, if we discard the fairy tale and rely on common sense, could have happened for several reasons, the main one being the invention of an instrument of obedience of many to few, which I have discussed above, and here I will only say that this is a shift in concepts. Or rather, the replacement of one concept with another. Even more correct, an attempt to combine two antagonistic concepts. The

Deuteronomy of Moses seemed to say: cabbage soup and flies - separately, and not in the same plate. Whereas the "First Law" preferred them together, which could not but cause a feeling of disgust and loss of appetite. People without appetite are weak people and you can do whatever you want with them.

Having invented an additional tool for world domination as if for the "tribe of traders" and on their behalf, Jesus, on mature reflection, which was especially characteristic of traders, competing with each other in a "bottleneck", decided to use this tool personally for himself, and not for his tribe. And this tribe, or rather a whole series of related tribes, never had a common king, if we do not count the biblical tales about the Judean and Israeli kings. These tribes always had a leader, a Fuhrer, a genius, before whose mind, and not whose title, they bowed down. Whether Solomon or Moses - such a leader, whose role Muammar Gaddafi is now unsuccessfully trying to play on stage, without officially occupying any government posts. But Gaddafi plays, and Christ, Solomon and Moses are the real leaders. The Chinese had such a leader as Deng Xiaoping when he stepped down from real power, but not Mao Zedong, who never let go of the reins, or Stalin. A leader is the greatest respect and obedience because of respect, not because of the KGB.

Having become the de facto king of the "secondary nations", Jesus became, as it were, the king of the "merchant tribe". The Jews might have forgiven him for this, if Jesus had not stuck his nose up in front of them. But he did stick his nose up, and in a completely unacceptable way, and in a completely lofty manner. That's why they crucified him.

The internally conflicting "First Law" could not help but cause a conflict when it was applied. But don't think that that was the end of it. Jesus was rich and noble, and he also earned the respect of the "merchants" for their intelligence. So he had plenty of "disciples" among the Jews. But the rest of the Jews were not without a leader either, only I forgot his last name, I haven't read the Bible for a long time. So a war began among the Jews, an ideological one, of course. But the Bible describes it as a real, bloody one, which had never happened among the Jews. All their wars to this day are purely economic, although sometimes they can shoot another leader.

3.2. The Judeo-Israelite War

The Kingdom of Judah or the God-worshippers fought against the Kingdom of Israel or the God-fighters, and the victory went, one would think, to the God-worshippers, since the Kingdom of Israel ceased to exist first. The trouble is that neither theologians nor historians can say which god the Judeans glorified, their own or someone else's (others')? The same goes for the God-fighters-Israelites, against which god did they fight, against their own or someone else's (others')? But since these two kingdoms fought against each other, the task is somewhat simplified. But I would like to say right away that I don't give a damn about the historical, or rather chronological, incompatibility of Jesus Christ and the Judeo-Israelite War (they are supposedly far from each other on the chronological scale). The entire "current" chronology is a complete deception and, besides, historians have arranged real events, first, second, third and so on, as many times in the order they like as there have been generations of historians. Therefore, only a logical analysis of the events themselves can help in this mess, without beginning or end.

In this regard, let us ask ourselves: was there at least one Jewish state, besides Israel today and the aforementioned kingdoms in the very depths of the centuries? In the interval between them, there was no clear one, as Zhirinovsky says. And he, the son of a "lawyer", knows better. Let us ask ourselves the following question: if the Jewish state never existed "in the eyes" of history, then why should it exist in ancient times? And if it did exist, where did it go? Not a single kingdom-state on Earth has disappeared

without a trace, at least something has remained. Even about Babylon, which has not been found in Mesopotamia to this day, thick books have been written. But only the Bible tells us about the Kingdom of Israel and the Kingdom of Judah. Not a single book, not even a “popular science” one. Let us ask ourselves a third question: if there never was a Jewish state, and the Jews are here, and have always been, though at first in the form of a trading tribe, then what is this “Judeo-Israeli war”? And why could it have arisen between essentially the same tribe of traders, although it may have been a kind of union of closely related tribes? After all, the Jews never fought in such clans, divided equally, although individually the Jews are always in a virtual war if their interests come into conflict. But as soon as the conflict is exhausted, there is no closer kin than these former enemies. This is evident from Berezovsky and Gusinsky, and such examples can be cited by the thousands. It is the Russians who can quarrel forever over nonsense, even if today nothing separates them.

Having received answers to these three questions, and knowing that the war did take place, it will become logically quite obvious that something had separated them, though not forever. Having established that there were never any wars with weapons in hand among the Jews later, we can say with certainty that the first war was also without weapons, for, as is well known, a bad example is contagious. Now we can return again to the God-fighters and God-worshippers.

I'll start with the God-worshippers. What god could they praise, their Yahweh, or what? It's impossible. Yahweh made them the smartest, gave them land and nations to serve, and they would suddenly, for no apparent reason, start sharing with their servant nations? And to praise Yahweh among their own is sheer stupidity, he was known, loved and respected even without them. So, some Jews began to praise some new god, and that's for sure. Moreover, not among their own, for that was useless, but among other nations, through which they had previously simply filtered, without going into the details of their confessions. And why the hell did the other part of the Jews begin to fight against God, after all, it wasn't among them that the God-worshippers "worked"?

The thing is, as I already wrote, Jesus invented an empire where one could become a king and enjoy the benefits not through burdensome trade, but strictly by inheritance. And all this happened first of all somewhere in the Persian Gulf region. Things started going well for him, which immediately narrowed the area of work for ordinary traders, since everything in the empire had already begun to be done according to a plan and without any market relations. It was very similar to Soviet socialism. That's when the God-fighters entered the arena. Jesus, of course, was immediately crucified, but it was too late. The God-worshippers infiltrated the aboriginal elite, put everything, as I have already said, on the basis of five-year plans, and the professional traders had to leave. The "God-fighting" kingdom ceased to exist, but the God-fighters, that is, the true Judeans, the worshipers of Yahweh, remained, where could they go? And the God-worshippers who started "rebuilding" ceased to be Judeans at all, they became half-Islamists-half-Christians, but the owners of nations. How they later finally split into Christians and Muslims, I have in another work. The main thing is that they stopped being not only traders, but also Judeans. Fortunately, they are very similar in appearance to the local peoples. Since then, we have been talking about them as Arab monarchs and emirs, who created a bunch of sciences and arts from the idleness that fell upon them. Their former opponents, who left these countries-peoples, also did not remember their former opponents anymore.

In general, the ideologically utterly defeated godfighters, they are also worshipers of Yahweh, left these places. There were many lands unoccupied by Jews at that time. Basically, they sailed along the Caspian to

the mouth of the Volga and founded the Khazar Khaganate there. Details in other works. In my earlier works, having succumbed to the magic of Egypt and Moses' captivity there, I believed that Constantinople was founded by Moses, who sailed there from today's Egypt via Alexandria and the eastern Mediterranean. Now, taking into account the possible location of Egypt itself in Asia Minor, we can take into account that the "defeated" godless not only went to found the Khazar Khaganate, but also to found Byzantium, which was always limited only by the triple walls of the ancient city of Constantine.

Then the Great Passageway of the Nations, which is described in my book, and which is completely unjustifiably called the Great Silk Road, becomes very logical for me. While it was used to transport only salt, and in both directions: to the East, all the way to the Pacific Ocean and Korea, and to the West, through the Bosphorus and partly through the already described Samara River to Kyiv.

3.3. From Byzantium to Medici

The Khazar Khaganate and Byzantium would never have collapsed, despite the fact that Byzantium was "mired in luxury and debauchery". "The Khazar Khaganate relied on the extraction and transit of salt, as well as on the trade in Russian women for Islam. The demand for women fell (details in the book), and salt was found everywhere except the Far East. This "pillar" was gone and the Khaganate evaporated (details in other works). "Byzantium", or rather Constantinople, lasted longer. When the transit of salt was sharply reduced, a trade in slaves from Kafa for rowboats - galleys appeared, which were regularly supplied to the market for money at first by Cossack robbers, who became Russian princes from Dmitry Donskoy. But then it was blamed on the Crimean Tatars, who did not even know about it. They didn't know, but they didn't object when historians told them about it. At the same time, there was a demand for Russian larch, and, in general, for Russian timber, which also went to the south of Europe through the Bosphorus, which historians called the route "from the Varangians to the Greeks" completely incorrectly. In reality, this was the route from Kostroma, Vologda, and even from the Trans-Urals, from the Konda River, through Volok Lamsky to the Dnieper and further - to Venice and generally to wherever piles were needed instead of a strip stone foundation. But I need Venice, since the route from Vologda and Kostroma is described in my other works. There was no one to organize this route except for Jewish traders. And Kyiv itself "emerged" precisely because the Jews built it, like our Smolensk, Vologda and Kostroma, and other ancient Russian cities. But the hereditary fishermen-natives of the Venetian lagoons also did not need larch. They did not intend to build palaces on their lagoons. But you yourself understand that behind the triple walls of Constantinople the Jews became very cramped, they should not be more than 5 percent of the indigenous population of all these "Greeks". So, under the guise of Greeks, they began to settle in warmer places, preferably near the sea. This is how Venice arose, then Florence. And from there it was not far to the Medici. But, naturally, first they created the coastal cities of Asia Minor and Greece itself, and first of all, on the islands, as intermediate trading ports

"Renaissance" as the triumph of obscurantism

(Medici and company, Gutenberg and the "ancient Greeks")

1. Introduction

Almost everything that I want to write in this article, I have already described in the book "The Mysterious Russian Soul against the Background of World Jewish History". I will add only new information obtained by me after writing the book, and will also try to prove that the "ancient Greeks", Aristotle, Celsus,

Lucian and others, are not at all older than Cosimo Medici himself, rather even younger, by about 10-20 years. And they also belong to the Renaissance, like Cosimo himself - its "founder".

I understand that reading this article without reading the previous ones is God's punishment, you will not understand anything. Therefore, I will briefly remind you what happened after the death of Christ. He turned the Christian church into a real tavern and brothel, indulging in the "morals" that reigned before his "reforms", under the goddesses-mothers. As I already said, everything described below happened just before the birth of Cosimo Medici, although historians have relegated all this to the distant "antiquity". And presenting to us the church debauchery, which for no apparent reason “arose” out of nowhere after centuries of decorous Christianity “during the time of Christ” and a little later.

Here is how it is presented: “the corruption of the church and morals in them reached incredible proportions… The nuns’ clothing, which emphasized their natural beauty and slenderness, did not contribute to the strictness of morals… Almost all the monasteries in Italy accepted male visitors…” “Nothing in Venice aroused such interest as the monasteries. Nobles were also frequent visitors there. And since all the nuns were beautiful and slender, not one was left without a lover. And the care of the matrons for morals was expressed in the fact that they helped the nuns find more skillful ways of meeting lovers and covering for them… Theaters were set up in many monasteries, and performances were allowed, but only nuns could act in them… The nuns of Genoa were not distinguished by restraint either. One of the papal decrees noted with regret: "The sisters from the monasteries of St. Philip and St. James wander the streets of Genoa, committing indecent acts that their unbridled fantasy dictates to them...”.

I will interrupt the selection of quotes to remind you of the non-existence of the Roman popes at that time, and that the singing in churches of only women speaks of matriarchy. The Medici, having driven women out of the churches, forced the castration of men so that they would sing with "angelic" voices instead of women.

I continue quoting. "The licentiousness of the nuns in the Bolognese monastery of John the Baptist was so great that the authorities were forced to disperse all the nuns and close the monastery. The nuns from the monastery of St. Leonardo were given over to the supervision of the monastery of St. Lawrence, whose strict and cruel rules earned him the reputation of the "executioner" of nuns... The number of nuns prosecuted by justice for debauchery grew every day. Each Bolognese monastery had a nickname: "the monastery of dolls", "the monastery of gossips", "the monastery of penitent Magdalenes", "the monastery of shameless women", "the monastery of Messalinas"... "In Valencia, the Spaniards freely penetrated the women's monasteries and it is difficult to draw a line between these holy monasteries and houses of bad reputation”. "Not only the lower clergy took part in the merry dances and songs, especially at Easter and Christmas, but even the most important church dignitaries. The monks of the male monasteries then danced with the nuns of the neighboring women's monasteries, and the bishops joined in their joy”.

We are approaching the time of Cosimo de' Medici. I repeat, these are all quotes from Nosovsky and Fomenko: "And then Champfleury, as the most modest example, passing it off as a caricature (!), cites an image of a supper of monks "and their lovers" from the 14th century Bible (from the Bible!), stored under No. 166 in the Paris National Library. The miniature depicts a typical Bacchic situation: one of the monks in the foreground indulges in love games with a nun, in the background the same thing is repeated on a mass scale. The number of such "caricatures" in medieval texts and Bibles is quite large. Such illustrations, including those in the Bible, are possible only if they depict the usual way of life of the Western European

medieval clergy, a fact that is recognized by everyone as normal; and if the artist had done this with the aim of censuring customs that had ceased to be approved under the new ideology, then, as N. A. Morozov noted, he would have depicted this feast in some disgusting form, with devils dragging sinners to hell, with the ugly consequences of diseases. Instead, many medieval Bibles are illustrated not only with images of bacchanalia, but also with "antique drawings": bunches of grapes, on which angels climb, indistinguishable from antique cupids, etc".

I will add that "antiquity" is supposed to be before or at the very beginning of our era, but not at all in the time of Cosimo de' Medici. I continue: "More than once", Champfleury notes, "when I examined ancient cathedrals, trying to find the secret of their confusing, obscene ornamentation, all my explanations seemed to me to be commentaries on a book written in some language alien to me... What should we think, for example, of the strange sculpture placed in the shadow under a column of the underground hall of the medieval cathedral in Bourges?" This sculpture represents the buttocks of a man protruding from a column in a passionate pose, executed with care and expression. The sculpture is placed in a place convenient for love games. How could the monks and parishioners who constantly used this temple tolerate such a sculpture, before the time when this sculpture began to be preserved as a relic of bygone days? Attempts to explain such sculptures and images (and there are quite a few of them!) by saying that they are "caricatures" carved in stone, in sacred temples, of those who serve in them, are not serious".

It is not without reason that I have cited such a long passage from the book of the aforementioned authors. It shows the inseparable connection between Christianity and pre-Christianity in the "method" of attracting people to temples. But since no one doubts that the pre-Christian cult is polytheism, then there should be no doubt that Christ used the "base passions of the people", and it was they, the passions, and not his "Sermon on the Mount" and "healings", that gave way to the spread of Christianity. And Christ understood this perfectly well.

And what is "primary Christianity" with this continuously functioning "cult" described above, stretching for 1500 years, until the first edition of the "Malleus" in 1486 and during its 28 editions until 1600? This is utter stupidity. Marx died in 1883, and already in 1917, 34 years later, Lenin realized his idea. And it did not take 1500 years of "intermediate stage" for there to be both capitalism and socialism at the same time. Therefore, I have no doubt that Christianity reached Western Europe just before Cosimo Medici, and he and his heirs "corrected" Christianity with the "Malleus".

2. Chronology I don't like

I have written many times that I hate chronology, because it is completely and utterly fictitious, distorted and represents incredible nonsense - all the way up to the very beginning of book printing, when it became impossible to hide the years. Therefore, I completely agree with Nosovsky and Fomenko that chronology should begin with the 13th century, even with the 14th. Thus, the chronology of events that I want to compare can be trusted with a fairly high degree of probability. So.

1355 - 1450 - **Gemistus Plethon**, the "Constantinople" adviser at the Ferrara-Florence Council, stayed with the initiator of this council, Cosimo Medici, in Florence to organize the Platonic Academy, having organized it, he went to die in his homeland, Greece.

1380 - 1459 – **Gian (Ivan) Francesco Poggio Bracciolini**. There is no information about him in either the Great Soviet Encyclopedia or the Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Dictionary of Antiquity: "Secretary of several

popes. From 1453 (the year of the capture of Constantinople by the “Turks”) – Chancellor of the Florentine Republic, often traveled to Germany, England, France, Switzerland. In 1414 he was at the Constantinople Church Council. He took out many ancient manuscripts of little-known or completely unknown Roman authors (Quintilian, Statius, Plautus, Tacitus, Columella, Cicero, Vitruvius, Frontinus, Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus, etc. He translated many works of Greek authors (Xenophon, Diodorus, Lucian) into Latin”. The details of his life will be set out below.

1389 – 1464 – **Cosimo de' Medici the Elder**, **also known as "Pater" and "Father of the Country"**, son of Giovanni (John-Ivan) Bicci (1360 – 1429), a Florentine banker. By the way, doesn't the title of either "Pater" or "Father of the Country" remind you of the Pope? I have already written many times that it is impossible to foresee all the blunders that will turn out to be a guiding star.

1400 – 1468 – **John Gutenberg** – the first printer who invented printing with movable letters, a revolutionary achievement for mass media, which, in comparison with "manuscripts", could no longer be destroyed or "remade", since there were many thousands of copies.

1431 – Cosimo de' Medici was arrested on charges of "**exalting himself higher than others**", for which, imagine, the death penalty was imposed. He bought everyone from the guard to the judges and instead of death was sentenced to exile from Florence. In Venice, "the exile was greeted as a monarch”. Don't you think that it was precisely for "exalting himself" to "Father of the Country", and if without equilibristics, then to the Pope.

1433 - 1499 - **Marcelino Ficchino**. From 1462 - at the age of 29, the head of the Platonic Academy in Florence "after Plethon", although Plethon died in 1450. According to the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, it was Ficchino who "organized the Platonic Academy".

1434 - Cosimo solemnly returned to power in Florence.

1434 - 1537 - the Medici family rules Florence under the name of "Principate Medici". Just note that Florence was the capital of Italy much later than the Medici family.

1434 – Gutenberg organizes a partnership for the "production of mirrors", and he owns half of the share, and the other half belongs to his unknown partners, or rather employees.

**1438** – Gutenberg "quarreled" with his partners. When dividing, "a machine or press is mentioned”. But Gutenberg's partnership, according to history, "produced mirrors”. S. Narovchatov, from whose book "Unusual Literary Criticism" ("Children's Literature", Moscow, 1981) I take this information, exclaims: "But did the craft partnership really make mirrors? Spiegel means mirror in German, had a homonym at that time, denoting a popular print book with pictures. The origin of the homonym is as follows: one of the most widespread books of the pre-Gutenberg era was called in Latin "Speculum humanae salvatiois", which translated meant: "Mirror of human salvation". Little by little, all popular prints began to be called Spigel - mirrors. Apparently, it was these "mirrors" that the Gutenberg partnership was engaged in. As well as today's German magazine "Spigel", I will add.

**1438** - **Cosimo organized the Ferrara-Florence Council**, where he met the aforementioned Gemistus Plethon, an advisor from the Byzantine side.

**1438** - 1445 - continuation of the Ferrara-Florence Council (GSE), 7 years.

**1438 – 1448** – Gutenberg, after the liquidation of his partnership, did something unknown for 10 years. In 1448, "the inventor had little money, and he turned to the wealthy Johann Fust". I have no doubt that Medici himself is hiding under this "pseudonym". Actually, I will prove it.

1449 – 92 – Lorenzo the Magnificent Medici, a great humanist and grandson of Cosimo. **Pope Pius II** (1405 – **1464**) – also a great humanist, pope since 1458. In my opinion, he had two names: secular and spiritual. The "core of Cosimo's library, for which Cosimo collected manuscripts from all over the world" is named after Lorenzo – Laurentian. Isn't that where our **Laurentian Chronicle** comes from? Straight from the library. And then our historians dug up some unknown "monk Laurentius".

**1450** - Gutenberg "signs a contract with Fust for the equipment of a printing house. Fust gives him a large sum of money - 800 guilders. Every year Fust invests another 300 guilders".

1450 - the first printer Gutenberg made his first impression.

1453 - the Turkish Sultan Mohammed II "took" Constantinople, according to traditional history, from Asia Minor, from the east, although "new chroniclers prove that Constantinople was taken from the west. Western Christians did not help their brothers - the Eastern Christians - to defend themselves from the Turks, despite the Ferrara-Florence Council convened by Cosimo Medici. Soon he sent messengers to his enemy Mohammed in Constantinople to collect ancient manuscripts. From that time on, he "became addicted to Greek philosophy" and created his own Platonic University, "translating all the Greek books into Latin", from which Europe learned only about Greek philosophy. Although this does not fit with Plato, who died 1806 years ago.

**1455** - "Five years later (from 1450) he (Gutenberg) is thrown out of business", that is, from the printing house he created.

**1455** - The first Bible is printed. That is, Gutenberg himself has nothing to do with the printing of the Bible.

**1450 - 1455** - S. Narovchatov asks himself about this time: "What books did Gutenberg himself print? His first editions are the Latin grammar of Donatus, the calendar and the **infamous indulgences.** It is easy to understand that book printing closely followed the **needs of medieval society here**", although, I will add, it was the height of the Renaissance. That is, Narovchatov thinks that Gutenberg himself needed indulgences, probably to pickle like cabbage, and not at all "the Pope-father" Cosimo Medici, to make money on people's fear.

1458 - Cosimo Medici created a senate of 100 people who could be influenced, instead of the previous 7 people who were impossible to influence: "he did not change a single letter of the law, but changed everything in its spirit".

**1462** - two years before his death, Cosimo "**filled the papal treasury to capacity** due to the monopoly on the extraction and supply of alum to Florence and the collection of papal tribute from all over Europe", and he himself became the richest man in Europe. It turned out that there was no difference between the papal treasury and Cosimo's property. I want to ask myself: is it not about indulgences? After all, the cost of these pieces of paper was almost zero thanks to Gutenberg. Besides, I have not heard of anyone getting rich like that on alum, which had been used for several thousand years, if we are to believe the traditional chronology. As for the papal tribute, collecting it is an unrivaled pleasure, as can be seen from Ivan Kalita.

1464 – Cosimo died, but his work lived on in his heirs, who became popes one after another.

1468 – Gutenberg died. S. Narovchatov: “Gutenberg himself, apparently, was no longer inclined to tempt fate. He leased the printing house to his relatives and covered the accumulated debts with the rent money. Now, without debts, without litigation, without competitors, he can end his days in peace”. Do these lines remind you of the fate of Singer, the inventor of the sewing machine? If, of course, you turn it 180 degrees so that the vectors coincide.

1484 – 1588 – “Julius Caesar (Jules Cesar) (real name Giulio Bordoni) – **French** philologist, critic, poet of the Renaissance”. "Scaligers (della Scala) - an Italian family, the Signores of Verona, until the Visconti, the rulers of Milan, seized power in it.

1486 - a fierce and completely official fight, sanctified by a papal bull, began with women-witches, and the entire Medicean "office" named after Gutenberg was only engaged in printing instructions for this "fight".

1540 - 1609 - Joseph Just **Scaliger - a French** humanist, the son of J. C. Scaliger - laid the foundations of scientific chronology, developed a system for unifying the calendar. In other words, this is the person by whose chronology we live today, and which we study at school.

**1582** - Gregorian calendar reform, when after October 4 they immediately switched to October 15. (See the book by Nosovsky and Fomenko "Rus` and Rome", vol. 2, p. 544).

In the given chronological selection, I have highlighted some dates, titles and names. I needed this to tie together some data scattered across books and encyclopedias. That is why I have collected them together.

First, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that Cosimo Medici, Poggio Bracciolini and Gutenberg are practically the same age, Plethon is 34 years older than Medici, and Ficchino, Plethon's successor in the "Plato" Academy, is 44 years younger. And this is all one team, only Gutenberg himself was not part of this team, but his printing press. The rest of the team were in reality and physically. I see some tension in the Plethon-Ficcino connection, since Plethon may well be a fictitious person (details in the book). Although the acquaintance of Medici, the organizer of the Ferrara-Florence Council, with a smart "Greek" at this very council, 12 years before his death, could have had an indelible influence on Medici for the rest of his life. After all, the "ancient Greeks" are the Jews of Constantinople. Moreover, Ficchino took over the reins of power in Plato's Academy from Plethon 12 years after his death, being 29 years old himself, that is, when Plethon died, Ficchino was 17 years old. What kind of head of the academy would he be, such a puppy? Even after 10 years. I have written about Ficchino in detail in my book. He "translated" almost all the "ancient Greeks" that Poggio Bracciolini did not have time to "translate". And it turned out that there were no "Greek" originals for his "translations" after Ficchino. Therefore, much later, the Greek "originals" were "recreated" based on Ficchino's Latin "translations".

I will have a long talk about Poggio Bracciolini below. For now, I will say a priori that he was a master of forgeries, a very talented master, very expensive and very successful in his work and life. Therefore, I think that he was the founder and first head of the Platonic Academy, who handed over the reins of its management to Ficchino when he began to understand something. Bracciolini died 9 years later than Plethon. And the young talented writer Ficchino with a rich imagination and solid knowledge of "ancient" writers could have become a better forger of antiquity than his mentor himself.

Secondly, Cosimo de' Medici the Elder, "Pater", "Father of the Country", who was clearly facing the death penalty for the idiotic pretext of "exalting himself above others", at the age of 42 (1431), 33 years before his death (1464), which happened to be the same year as Pope Pius II (1405-1464) — all this is sheer gibberish. Moreover, Pope Pius II was himself a writer and humanist, so much so that he wrote the most obscene book imaginable. And our "Pater", who officially had no connection whatsoever with the church, suddenly, for no apparent reason, "convenes" the Council of Ferrara-Florence, one of the most important councils, a unifying council of the Eastern and Western churches, at which even our Russian Patriarch Isidore signed a union unifying the churches. (Actually, some tsar of ours, Vasily Vasilyevich the Dark, I think, later fired Isidore for this.) Can you imagine all this? "Father" does all this, while Pope Pius II sits back and picks his nose. Even the Medici's church money is in the basement. Basically, he's not a pope, he's a church mouse. And by the end of his life, in 1462, "Father" Medici had "filled the papal treasury to the brim", and all on alum alone. This whole mess is beyond belief.

Let me tell you how it really happened. All this happened shortly after the death of Christ. He managed to stir up the people by transforming pagan temples with their mother goddesses, drinking, and promiscuity into "Christian" temples with the same array of "amusements", even further liberating them from morality (which didn't yet exist) in order to attract the flock. And then Cosimo de' Medici was born, and Christ vanished, although he is depicted as Pope Gregory VII Hildebrand in Nosovsky and Fomenko's works.

All these "temples" were completely autonomous, just like brothels and pubs. They were completely self-sufficient and financially independent, and at their helm stood almost the same representatives of the mother goddesses, now called deaconesses. Even today, historians cannot hide the fact that deacons were virtually nonexistent, and it was the deaconesses who ran everything in Christian churches.

Nowadays, our Orthodox servants of God are somewhat uncertain about the difference between a deacon and a priest. Thanks to Andrei Gnezdilov, a hospice doctor (a facility for the terminally ill) (AIF, No. 31, 2001): "In theory, the church contains two directions: liturgical (service to God) and diaconal (service to man). But the diaconal service is underdeveloped. A priest comes to the bedside of a dying person not to console them, but to act as an intermediary between them and God. That is, this is also a liturgy", meaning, I would add, service to God, not man, which is what a deacon is supposed to do.

Do you now understand who deaconesses served in early Christian churches, and, earlier, in pagan ones? Only they weren't called deaconesses, of course, but something like priestesses, or sibyls, vestals, and so on. But let's return to Medici. He set himself the task of turning all these autonomous churches into something like McDonald's, controlled from a "single" center. And perhaps he was a bit hasty; he still had little money, but he had already "exalted himself above others" by appointing himself, frankly, pope. And, note that he was the first pope in all this Christianity, or rather, Catholicism. Otherwise, they wouldn't have decided to hang him or burn him—that is, to execute him. He bought his way out, the poor fellow. He did become pope, of course, but only later, when he began selling indulgences printed on a press confiscated from Gutenberg. But understand Medici, too. He was already 42 years old in 1431. How long should he wait? But then Medici lost the desire to officially appear before posterity as Pope. So he appointed himself "father and father of the country", but unofficially. This was so that later it wouldn't be said that he was the one who introduced Catholicism to the planet—modesty, you know. But not only modesty. Now, if you could convince the whole world, with the help of Ficchino and Bracciolini, that this happened 1,450 years ago, then that would be a different matter. A thousand-year-old tradition, again, is no small thing. He knew that

people love to answer idiotic questions when the answer is impossible: it's always been that way. You haven't forgotten that I just finished second, have you?

Third, I've singled out 1438, the year Gutenberg, the publisher of "mirrors", fell out with his "companions". Seven years had passed since the decision was made to hang or crucify their "Father of the Country", Cosimo, as one prefers, and four years had passed since his "triumphant return" to Florence and the beginning of the "Medici Principate". That same year, the Medici organized the Council of Ferrara-Florence, which wasn't a "council", or congress, as they say today, but something akin to the United Nations (UN) or our Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), operating on a permanent basis. After all, the "council" lasted for seven whole years. That is, until 1445, Cosimo wasn't the "Roman" pope in the full sense of the word, but merely the "chairman of the representatives" of the chaotic churches. And by 1445, I think, he had already taken control of this very "council". Just as he had done with the Florentine Senate in 1458, replacing seven disobedient men with 100 obedient ones, "without changing a single letter of the law, but in its spirit—changing everything". It's even possible that this very "senate" wasn't Florentine at all, but that very "Council of Ferrara-Florence", which included seven large, "independent" bishops, and he replaced them with hundreds of various small church "fry" hungry for money. Just like today's deputies. Not a penny to their name, and votes are freely available. And the more of them there are, the cheaper they are. But in this point, I'm not talking about the Medici, per se, but about Gutenberg.

Gutenberg was exactly 38 years old in 1438. The divine spark usually appears earlier in great inventors. Just think of Edison. So, I think Gutenberg had already been producing his "mirrors" for eight years. Note that his first printed work was a grammar, needed for students and for learning to write in general. So he quietly published his grammar using movable letters, and no one cared about his invention. After all, printing was already known using blocks on which all the letters of a page were cut out. Splat—and the page was ready. Publishing daily newspapers was just impossible; by the time you cut out a page, a week had passed and the news was out of date. But the church didn't publish newspapers; why would it need them? And there was no variety in books at all. The books that were needed had long since been cut out on blocks, page by page. And they slapped them down almost like today — out of necessity, and there was no pursuit of variety because there were no "Marinins" alive yet.

Now imagine an indulgence. For those who don't know, it's a written absolution of sins, officially issued by the church for money. And who among us doesn't sin? I've never met anyone like that. And I also know very well that everyone, without exception, is afraid to sin, though only after they've committed it. This is evident even in the bandits who constantly show up at churches asking for forgiveness. Now imagine a list of the various sins that arise in humanity. It wouldn't be enough to list all the fingers and toes of a human being, it wouldn't be enough to list all the fingers of all humanity. But handing out a piece of paper stating that sins for such-and-such a year are forgiven, without any specifics, is also unacceptable. Or rather, that's what they did because they didn't have a printing press with movable type. There was one board with an impersonal and vague forgiveness, but would you charge much for such text? It's a different matter when the last name, first name, and patronymic are beautifully printed, and the forgiven offense is specifically stated—whether it's putting the right shoe on the left foot, killing your mother-in-law, or cheating on your beloved. It's even better than trying to get a piece of paper with a "forecast" in ten different variations from a guinea pig's teeth at the market. How wonderful, isn't it? And the prices can be so high that you can't believe it with joy, because you've received a piece of paper directly from God, and it's so specific it takes your breath away. This is where Gutenberg's printing press with inserted letters is needed—one for every

taste, and an immediate answer from God. You can't stockpile a million boards, and even if you do, how will you find the one you want? But you need to: come, pay, and receive. But that's only one side of the need for Gutenberg's press.

Another aspect of the Gutenberg press' necessity was the productivity of labor at the "Plato Academy". How many years had it been in existence? Ah, almost nothing. Medici had only just met Pletho at his Ferrara-Florence Council. But it's a poor soldier who doesn't dream of becoming a general, a poor landlord who doesn't take care of his sleigh for the winter in summer. After all, Medici, Pletho, and Bracciolini had already discussed everything, knowing full well that not only the "manuscripts" needed to be burned, but also the old page boards—into the oven, too. A whole new history was dawning, one that would require an incalculable number of boards, and at such a pace that there wouldn't be enough carvers. I think Bracciolini understood this and even communicated his opinion to Cosimo. However, I'll talk about Bracciolini later. As for the productivity of Plato's Academy, it wasn't just Bracciolini who sat there with the young Ficchino in his arms. The Academy is a serious organization, and it wasn't just janitors who worked there. They desperately needed Gutenberg's press.

Fourth, from 1438 to 1448, a full ten years passed without a trace of Gutenberg, precisely after the "quarrel with his partners", after which he was supposed to receive half of their shared fortune in the production of "mirrors". For some reason, historians insisted that Gutenberg "invented" letter printing around 1450. They also placed the new and final "conflict" between Gutenberg and Fust at this time, with the idea that Fust "finally threw" Gutenberg out of business within the next five years (1455), precisely the year the first printed Bible was published. Most likely, Gutenberg had a "dispute" with his partners in his life, but not two, but one, and not in 1455, but in 1438, and not even with a bunch of his collaborators, each of whom had a meager share of the joint property, but specifically with Fust, a servant of the Medici. And Gutenberg wasn't simply thrown out of business; he was thrown out for his temper, for his honesty. It's no wonder he was later blamed for the first printing of indulgences, without naming the date.

Therefore, I need to turn to the history of indulgences. The Soviet know-it-all, the "defender of enslaved peoples", devoted only a few lines to indulgences, claiming they "emerged" somewhere in the 12th or 13th centuries. I turned to the Britannica, which is also less than forthcoming, claiming Pope Urban II used indulgences quite resourcefully. The fact is that knights didn't want to go "to the front", to the Crusades, but they sinned more than anyone else, as befits soldiers. So the Urban Pope forgave the sins of all who agreed to go on the campaign for the "conquest of the Holy Sepulchre", beginning in 1095. After the 12th century, "indulgences began to be sold more frequently". Their use was expanded by Pope Innocent II, who expanded it to raise funds "for the decoration of the church in Cluny in 1132". But since the churches weren't entirely subordinate to the pope at the time, they quickly began selling indulgences themselves, each for the decoration of its own church. I consider this a complete and shameless lie, not only because Christ didn't yet exist back then, but also because, in fact, the Crusades were all directed toward Bohemia and Moravia, against the Hussites, to bring them under Catholic "protection", and not at all against the "Turks". Constantinople actually "took" Cosimo de' Medici, but only virtually, luring away "Greeks" like Plethon. That's why the knights weren't willing to go on these "crusades" against disobedient Catholics for free. I've written about the "fall of Byzantium" in more detail in my book and other articles.

Here, unexpectedly, I found the words "omni culpa i poena" in the Britannica—"from all guilt and punishment", meaning "God's". This was precisely what was written in the first indulgences for knights,

naturally, even before Gutenberg's printing press. But just a few paragraphs earlier, I assumed exactly this—a wholesale forgiveness of the most diverse sins. It's clear now that I assumed correctly.

The most important thing is that from the very beginning of the sale of indulgences (even in the Tertiary geological period), not once before Martin Luther, until 1517, did anyone ever protest against indulgences; there's not a word about it in history. Is it even possible to imagine such a thing? After all, it's such a vile, unnatural, and offensive thing that it cannot go unnoticed in history. It's no coincidence that Luther made his worldwide name through his fight against indulgences, and the campaign against them swept across Europe like a veritable avalanche, swift and radical.

I consider the following notice on the doors of the cathedral in Speer equally important: "Full pardon of all sins, punishments, and guilt". Imagine, this modest notice, "advertising" the sale of indulgences, was hung on the church door in 1451, a year after Gutenberg "signed the treaty with Fust", before he had even printed his first Bible (1455).

Now consider the year Martin Luther hung his famous 95 theses against indulgences on the doors of All Saints' Church (Wittenberg). That year was 1517, just 66 years after the announcement of their sale. Do you see how quickly the public reacts to the "lawlessness" perpetrated by the church? Historians say the people sat there, shitting their pants, for 422 years, happily buying indulgences, starting all the way back in 1095. Note that communist ideology lasted only 70 years in our country. So 60-70 years is a perfectly canonical limit for all sorts of idiocy. And Pope Pius V, in 1567, exactly 50 years after Luther's 95 Theses, abolished all indulgences for sale with his bull, "and that bishops should destroy all shorts in which indulgences were presented". But indulgences are still sold "under the table" by the Catholic Church today, just as our Orthodox Church speculates in vodka, cigarettes, and untested gold.

At the end of my fourth point, I'd like to pose a rhetorical question: was Cosimo de' Medici such a fool that he wouldn't have thought to send indulgences back to antiquity? After all, Bracciolini was in his service. I'll conclude with the Laurentian Chronicle, which every self-respecting historian knows almost by heart and recites more often than "what would you like?" Don't be fooled. Eternal memory to Bracciolini! The same as to Nero.

Fifth, "by 1462, Cosimo de' Medici had filled the papal treasury to capacity"—from selling alum, I'll add, since according to history, he didn't trade in anything else, devoting all his precious time to "searching" for Greek manuscripts all over the world, to the Platonic Academy. He adorned Florence, the Uffizi Gallery, you see, he created? Believe it or not, but I know that this was the first peak in sales of indulgences, printed to individual orders on a press stolen from Gutenberg. After all, exactly 11 years had passed since the first advertisement "on the door of the Spree Cathedral". I'll call as witnesses businessmen, specialists in selling something new, something unique, something the world had never seen before. How many years does this peak in sales last? But I have other witnesses, too. Britannica: "Bishop Albert of Hohenzollern forced his flock and subordinate priests to purchase papal concessions in order to obtain the archbishopric of Mainz and Halberstadt, and agreed to promote the sale of indulgences in his domains. Fifty percent of the proceeds went to him personally, and the other half to Rome". How could this not "fill the treasury to the brim"? And not just the Roman one. The production costs for these indulgences were practically zero, especially with the Gutenberg press.

3. Poggio Bracciolini

I took the life story of this close associate of Cosimo de' Medici from the book: M.M. Postnikov. "A Critical Study of the Chronology of the Ancient World", Vol. 1. "Antiquity". (Kraft + Lean, Moscow, 2000). The life of Ficciolo, Bracciolini's successor in the "translation of ancient Greeks", is described in my aforementioned book.

Poggio Bracciolini was born in 1380 in Terra Nuovo near Florence. He served under Popes Innocent VII, Gregory XII, and Alexander V in Bologna, where the Apostolic See had been temporarily transferred. Poggio, "a man of docile conscience", reappeared in Florence as early as 1422. Already in his youth, he had at his disposal the "rich library of Coluccio Salutati, Chancellor of the Florentine Republic". He wrote a "History of Florence" and exchanged "witty and profound letters" with Nicholas, Laurentiis, and Cosimo de' Medici. "His honorarium proves how highly he was valued: for dedicating the "Cyropody' to Alfonso of Aragon, Poggio received 600 gold pieces—an enormous sum at the time". He ended his life "at the height of a high and powerful position—as Chancellor of the Florentine Republic". Poggio Bracciolini is "a typical Florentine nobleman, an aesthete, and a bourgeois, a 15th-century Epicurean, a man with beautiful dreams and a base life, a man like a volcano, from which sometimes spurts living fire, sometimes flows stinking mud". "Such was the man who "discovered' Tacitus".

He made his first "discovery" "in a forgotten, damp tower of the Monastery of St. Gallen". There, "the works of Quintilian, Valerius Flaccus, Asconius Pedianus, Nonius Marcellus, Probus, and others were found". In fact, Bracciolini was a scribe in his youth, but a very capable one. And in general, scribes in those days, before the era of printing, were almost half simple forgers. "Scribes had a bad reputation in 15th-century society. One notary at the end of the 14th century exclaimed in a letter to a friend: "I have found an excellent scribe, and—imagine!—not in a penal servitude". And service "under the popes", and not just one, meant a scribe of the highest order, possessing the highest ability to do as they were ordered, and in such a way that no one would suspect it.

"Having sold his own copy of Titus Livy to Alfonso of Aragon, Poggio used the proceeds to buy a villa in Florence. Poggio's clients included the Medici, the Sforzas..". "His own copy of Livy"—this suggests that he was, after all, a simple scribe, and how he made his "copies" is now impossible to determine.

"The main manuscripts of Tacitus' Annals and History, known as the First and Second Medicean Codex, are kept in Florence, in the library founded by Cosimo de' Medici", that is, in the Laurentian Library. "The two Medicean Codexes, combined, provide a complete summary of all that has come down to us of Tacitus' historical works".

In 1425, Poggio Bracciolini, through the publisher Niccoli, attempted to "interest" Cosimo de' Medici, claiming that "a certain monk was offering him a shipment of ancient manuscripts, including several unknown works by Tacitus". Cosimo was intrigued. Now these manuscripts could be produced, since without finding a buyer, there was no point in attempting to forge anything. The game of hide-and-seek (the monk was always hiding somewhere) dragged on for nearly five years. Finally, in 1429, the Medici received these "manuscripts". The historian Hochar suggests that "they came from the Roman workshop of the Florentine Poggio Bracciolini". "Having counted the many errors that a first-century Roman could not have made, Hochar notes those that reveal the author to be a man with the worldview and traditions of the 15th century". Hochar should have added that Bracciolini and the Medici worked hand in hand, but would he dare raise his plebeian hand against the founder of the Renaissance? And the "scribe" would tolerate anything.

"Lamberteschi proposed that Poggio undertake some secret historical work. The secrecy was so strict that Poggio was to work in Hungary—while his location was assumed to be in England. The entire secrecy that was demanded of him (Poggio), and which he accepted, shows that the proposed undertaking, although literary and scholarly, was not a pretty one". This, they might tell me, is the only historical fact; there's no need to generalize from it. How can there be? Are thieves caught every time they steal? If they were caught every time, there wouldn't be any thieves. So they're caught rarely, but what percentage, exactly, is a mystery to me. But not every third time. That's absolutely certain, otherwise they'd never get out of prison.

"Before starting his Tacitus scam, Poggio tries to sell Cosimo de' Medici and Leonello d'Este some magnificent copy of Livy's Titus—and again, in a mysterious setting: a remote monastery on an island in the North Sea..". The most important thing: "Historians chose to ignore Hochard's work, although no serious objections were raised by any of them".

This is where I'd leave the historians. See how Hochard "covers" for Medici himself, whom Bracciolini shamelessly "deceives"? And this is a historian, so to speak, with progressive views, who dared to "attack" the obvious stupidities and abominations of history, without touching the "honor" of Medici himself—the poor thing with a wad of indulgences under his lap. The rest of the historians are so devoted to this same shitty history that they don't even pay their precious attention to this "fool and traitor to history". Can you imagine what they'll write themselves? I can imagine. In fact, all my works are dedicated to precisely this.

Two of a kind, as they say. "Plato became widely known only after the Florentine philosopher Marcello Ficino brought the Latin (emphasis is mine) manuscript of the Dialogues to the publisher Venet in 1482, declaring it his translation from a Greek manuscript. After the publication of Ficino's manuscript, readers immediately noted its numerous anachronisms (emphasis is added). The second edition of Ficino's "translation" was published in Florence in 1491, and the third, corrected as much as possible for anachronisms, was published in Venice in 1517. (This was when Luther posted his theses). Ficino never presented his Greek manuscripts to anyone until his death; his heirs also failed to find them—the manuscripts disappeared without a trace (emphasis is added). Only thirty years after the first edition of Plato, the Venetian Cretan Marcus Masur presented a Greek text of Plato's works in 1512. This text was immediately printed in 1513, and then, with constant corrections, it was reprinted many times throughout the 16th century. "It is significant that most of the references to Plato's name in "ancient" Greek authors became known after the appearance of Ficino's translations".

Shouldn't you, gentlemen professional historians, start rewriting it? If you "make a mistake", prison is the answer. I can write whatever comes to mind; I'm not a historian. But you should be in prison, like mining engineers—for a mine accident "with grave consequences".

4. Chikatilo is almost an angel. There are infinitely worse.

Cosimo de' Medici died in 1464, and "Malleus" was first published in 1486, 22 years later. So, Cosimo de' Medici isn't directly to blame for "Malleus". But here's what Ernest Renan writes in the chapter "The Complete Triumph of the Hierarchy": "Obedience to ecclesiastical authority is now more important in a Christian than the gifts of grace". From now on, these gifts will even arouse suspicion... Schism is the most serious ecclesiastical crime... The hierarchy will even prefer a sinner... to an arrogant ascetic who justifies himself or imagines that he needs no justification".

In the chapter "Achievements of Organization", the same Renan notes: "Amid circumstances apparently so difficult, the **organization of the Church was completed with astonishing speed**. <…>...without any support from gendarmes or courts, the bishopric managed to put order above freedom, in a society originally built on inspiration. <…> The cause of Jesus could be considered saved on the day when the Church was recognized as having direct authority, representing the authority of Jesus. From then on, the Church dominates the individual and, if necessary, expels him from its midst. Soon the Church, an unstable and changeable body, is personified in the elders; the authority of the Church becomes that of the clergy, who possess the gifts of grace, mediators between God and the believer. The Church became everything in Christianity; one more step, and the bishop became everything in the Church. Obedience to the Church, then to the bishop, is considered the most important duty; innovation is a sign of falsity; heresy is henceforth the worst crime of a Christian".

Renan further summarizes: "It may be said that the organization of the Churches had five successive stages of development, four of which were passed through in the period covered by this work. (160-180 AD – Mine.) First, the primitive ecclesia (circle), all members of which are equally imbued with the Spirit. Then the elders or presbiteri (presbyters) acquire significant police powers in the Church and absorb the Church. Then the president of the elders, the episcopos (bishop), almost completely absorbs the authority of the elders (presbyters), and, consequently, the rights of the Church. Then the bishops of the various churches correspond with each other and form the Catholic, universal Church. Among the bishops, there is one, the Roman, clearly destined for a great future. **The Pope, the Church of Jesus, transformed into a monarchy, with its capital in Rome, looms in the dim distance**…" (emphasis is mine).

Let me note right away that this "vague distance" supposedly existed before Cosimo de' Medici for a full 1,358 years, if you count the Council of Ferrara-Florence, where three churches supposedly gathered for unification: the Catholic, Constantinople, and Russian (200 representatives). But they didn't unite, each remaining on its own. So what were they doing twiddling their thumbs at that Council of Ferrara-Florence? The fact is, Cosimo gathered not those recorded in history, but all of his own—future Catholics. And I've already written about this. And he became its chairman, "father", "father of the country". That's all. And he would have been a complete fool if he hadn't sent everything Renan describes back to where Renan got it from: the 2nd century, during the time of Marcus Aurelius, the "Roman" emperor. Especially since Bracciolini is always at hand.

Please return to Renan's quote again and ponder it. For example, consider the fact that "**the organization of the Church was completed with astonishing speed**". How so, you might involuntarily exclaim. 1,358 years—is that "astonishing speed"? It takes 1,358 years of uninterrupted effort to "place order above liberty"? "The day when the Church was recognized as having direct authority, representing the authority of Jesus" **lasted 1,358 years**?

And how can I understand that "since then (1,358 years) the Church has dominated individuals and, if necessary, expelled them from its midst" if I'm getting right down to the witch hunts? They began in 1486, after all. Before that, men were like dogs, standing on their hind legs before these "witches". Or did you not read the introduction to this article? The Church never dominated any "individuals" before the Medici. That's for sure.

But the most important thing is that it was Medici who, with fabulous wealth, **created an organization**, a **church structure**, and now he could die peacefully, the gyrocompass set in motion and its needle pointing strictly in one direction. Nothing but circumstances and Luther's intellect could have deflected it.

From Britannica: "**A detailed, legally binding** (emphasis is mine) theological document (1486), regarded today as the standard guide to combating witchcraft, covers both the detection and eradication of witchcraft. It remained in effect even into the 18th century. Its appearance did much to encourage the hysterical witch hunts in Europe that lasted two centuries. Two Dominican monks wrote under the pseudonym Malleus: Johann Sprenger, dean of the University of Cologne (Germany), and Heinrich Kraemer, professor of theology at the University of Salzburg (Austria). In 1484, Pope Innocent VIII signed the bull Summis Desiderantes, in which he "deplored the spread of witchcraft in Germany and authorized Sprenger and Kraemer to eradicate it".

The Malleus codified the folklore and rituals of the pagan faith of Alpine peasants and was "justified" very simply by Holy Scripture (Exodus 22:18): "You must not allow the witch to live". This "work" is divided into three parts. The first outlines the reality of witches and emphasizes their depravity. Moreover, any distrust of demonology is condemned as outright heresy. Due to the diabolical nature of the enemy (the witch), any witness—I repeat, anyone, regardless of whether they can be trusted or not—can be accepted as a witness only against witches. In other words, the witness was required purely for show.

Part two is a summary of incredible stories about witchcraft—for example, diabolical pacts, sexual relations with devils (incubi and succubi), and transvestism.

Part three describes the judicial procedures to be followed when testing a witch. Torture is sanctioned as a means of ensuring the truth of a confession. "Even unordained Christian ministers, as well as secular authorities, are called upon to assist in the task of exterminating those whom Satan has enticed into his net". If it's unclear, let me clarify: everyone must fight the enemy, just as Stalin called for fighting the enemies of the people.

"The Malleus" went through 28 editions over 114 years between 1486 and 1600", meaning it was reprinted every four years. Note that Gutenberg only received his first printing press in 1450, and printed his first Bible in 1455. And so, with the Malleus, the Christian "humanist" church, having just acquired Gutenberg's printing press and preaching love in words, supplies the peoples of Europe with the same kind of printed tram tickets they now supply. They couldn't find anything else to print in such terrifying quantities except "legislative instructions" for combating female witches. After all, there were several times fewer editions of the Bible itself. This is a very significant quote. It demands the utmost attention, for the chronology here is precise, and so many of these books were printed that now they can never be hidden or "corrected". Note that I divided the Malleus editions equally over 114 years, which means there were four years between editions. But what kind of mass struggle doesn't begin with a deafening hammering of the "truth" into people's heads. Therefore, it must be acknowledged that in the first years, the Malleus was published four times a year, until the "supply" became excessive, and then only "solvent demand" was maintained. It can't be otherwise; the Malleus is not a primer, which is required evenly throughout the years. I will draw some conclusions.

First, it is noteworthy that the motto of this shameful "struggle" is verses from Moses, the first person to call for a fight for men's rights. And I previously linked this to the overthrow of matriarchy, the Amazons. In general, male religions, where a male god is at the helm, are a very late religion. And I have said this

sufficiently in my book and other works. All the previous main gods were mother goddesses. It should also be added that Judaism treats women worse than any other religion in the world, and I have also cited data on this. In other words, the Judeans placed women in the most humiliating conditions; I would even say they did so with a kind of malicious rapture. Like rebellious slaves slaughtering their masters, without discerning who was right or who was wrong. I called this the greatest revolution on Earth. And I argued that it certainly didn't happen "on the border between the Early and Late Paleolithic", roughly 30,000 years ago.

Secondly, the Medici. He pioneered written history, or rather, printed history, since written history cannot exist in a single copy; it can only be a joke. And it was he who created the philosophy of Christianity, disseminated throughout the world. It was he who collected all the ancient manuscripts, reworked them as needed, and burned the rest, sealing this act with printing. After all, the Malleus was published just twenty-two years after Cosimo's death. Here it should also be added that there were two Cosimos de' Medici, one the Elder and the other the First. This, too, feels like a bit of a hoax, especially since Cosimo I de' Medici lived at the height of the witch-hunt, after the publication of the Malleus.

Third, women were queens of states. I've already cited many examples of this, and then supplemented it all with a quote from Frazer, who quite clumsily explains the succession to the throne by a "foreign man" who married the daughter-heir to the throne. And if this had happened, let's just imagine, during the time of the Medici himself, or even a little earlier, how would it have been perceived by his contemporaries? I'm not even talking about you and me. Therefore, this entire revolution had to be consigned as far back into antiquity as possible, preferably thousands of years from the eyes and ears of our sisters, wives, and fiancées. And doesn't the current process of women's emancipation, which has engulfed the most developed and literate countries, remind us of women just now waking up to their fate? This process of "waking up to it" couldn't have lasted for thousands of years. In 1486, they began to burn them at the stake as witches, and a hundred years later, especially in Western Europe, they had regained many of their rights. Just remember how one of our visitors to Muscovy complained that in the West, women had too many rights and "they behaved unbridled, owning villages and towns". (See the book.) We are now being fed the lie that women were supposedly burned in the Middle Ages, without specifying when these Middle Ages were. But this "detailed legal document" was signed by the Pope at the height of the Renaissance (1486). In 1432, Ficino, at the age of 29, became head of the Platonic Academy, but the Academy itself was founded by Plethon. And here you go, in 1486, the "decree on the fight against witches", when the world was "reborn" beyond belief.

Fourth, women deaconesses in Christianity. It would have been impossible to trace them back to the centuries before the birth of Christ, when Christ himself hadn't yet lived. So they were all removed in the very first centuries. After all, there were plenty of women deaconesses there. They think we'll consider the rank of deacon quite insignificant, secondary, and that "women's work" can be applied. So why aren't there deaconesses today? And there haven't been for 1800 years. But back then, the rank of deacon was anything but insignificant. He was the leader of a Christian sect, not in service to God, but in service to the parishioners, as I wrote above. And remember when the statue of the female pope was removed from the church? I wrote about this in detail in "Novochron-1", but I'll repeat: in the 16th century. And in the 17th century, Pope Clement VIII (there was also a Clement VII from the Medici, though this too could be a forgery) ordered the portrait of "Pope John IV – a woman from England" obscured and replaced with an image of Pope Zachary. At that time, both the Renaissance and witchcraft, or rather the fight against them, raged simultaneously. But is it really possible that, under the "developed patriarchy" that exists today,

women would have served as popes in the Middle Ages? That's just the point: the times were semi-matriarchal, semi-patriarchal, so the fight against women should have been fought not in the Paleolithic tens of thousands of years ago, but "here and now", as TV presenter Lyubimov tells us every day.

Fifth, if it weren't for the condensation of world history to the early 11th century by many modern chroniclers, beginning with Newton, it would never have occurred to me to extend matriarchy into the 15th century, although there's plenty of evidence to support it. And one of the main prerequisites is precisely the fight against witches, initiated while Medici the Elder was still alive and, I think, not without his influence. For he reshaped Christianity in the most shameless manner. He had plenty of money, you see; he "personally" organized the Council of Ferrara-Florence. Imagine some modern banker gathering three churches together in one place? And churches these days are accommodating, I mean, to bribes from bandits. Not like before, when, over some "wafer" or "piece of relic", all three churches gathered together could tear each other's throats.

5. Short Women's Stories from "Ancient Rome"

I understand that Bracciolini and Ficchino, no matter how brilliant they were, couldn't have invented from their own, as they say now, "makitra", so many "life-stories" as would be required to fill the gaping historical gap of the early and middle ages of Christianity. Nor could they have "built a Roman Empire" that didn't actually exist, but was absolutely necessary to create history itself from scratch. So it's no surprise that they began to rewrite the female names of the matriarchy as male ones. But even that wasn't enough. Some women left such a mark on history that it became impossible to remove them. Therefore, they merely "install" kings into the realm, but don't reign themselves. And to make the story longer, they use characters twice and three times, under different names. This results in both humor and sin. See for yourself.

1. Tullia transfers power in Rome to Tarquinius (Ancient Rome, 6th century BC).

1. 2. Amazalunt (Julia Maesa) transfers power in Rome to her son, the Goth Amalaric. Constantinople recognized Amazalunt (and Amalaric) as the legitimate kings of Rome. (Ancient Rome, 6th century BC). Do you notice the "BC" and "AD"?

2. Next to the ancient Tullia is Lucretia. Both women were wives of the Tarquinii. Tullia was the wife of Tarquinius Superbus, and Lucretia was the wife of Tarquinius Collatinus. Both women were of royal lineage. Both women actively participated in the struggle for the Roman throne. Livy says nothing about other women of this time (Ancient Rome, 6th century BC).

2.1. Next to Amazaluntha is her sister, Matasunta. Both women played an active role in the governance of the Roman Empire. Nothing is known of other women who played important roles in Italian political life (Medieval Rome, 6th century AD).

3. Lucretia (6th century BC) committed suicide. Tullia was exiled. Amazaluntha (6th century AD) was murdered. Men, it seems, do not exist in the royal house. Don't you think that friends Bracciolino and Ficchino only had to slightly change their names, adding "BC" in one case and "AD" in the other, and the same story would begin to live 1,200 years apart? Not such a difficult task, I say.

4. In 534 AD, Amazaluntha granted the Goth Theodatus the title of king, but retained power for herself. What does this mean if not autocratic rule? Upon receiving the crown, Theodatus kills Amazalunt. It is Amazalunt's death that triggers the famous Gothic War.

4.1. When news of Lucretia's suicide reaches the people, the outraged crowd dethrones Tarquinius the Proud and exiles his brother, his wife, and children. The Tarquinian War breaks out. Try dethroning a king after the advent of printing. And the Gothic and Tarquinian Wars are essentially twins in plot.

5. Plutarch explains the start of the civil war precisely by the death of Julia (Julia and Pompey were the wives of the main king), and the warring parties are Julius Caesar (Caesar is a nickname) and Pompey. What the hell, fighting over the king's "yet another" wife? There are many wives, but only one king. Here we can clearly see the counterfeiting of Julia for Julius, Pompey for Pompey.

6. Antonina, wife of Belisarius, is one of the central figures of the Gothic War of the 6th century CE. Antony is Julius Caesar's first and closest confidant, one of the main characters in the civil war of the 1st century BC. Antonina constantly accompanies Belisarius. Antony is always at Julius Caesar's side. But Antonina is a notorious prostitute of Rome. According to Procopius, she is the number two prostitute, following the number one prostitute – Theodora (Justinian's wife). Antony is the notorious libertine of Rome. Here, it's completely impossible to tell who is the man and who is the woman. A clear attempt to remake matriarchal law into patriarchal law with minimal historical costs. Moreover, prostitution is so characteristic of matriarchy, judging by the mother goddesses of the time of Aphrodite and the pagan temples. But these temples have all "collapsed”, and Christian churches have been built on the ruins. Isn't there a pressing need to push all this information as far back into "ancient times" as possible? Even what was witnessed by both the Medici and his friends—experts in the "discovery" and "translation" of "ancient manuscripts”.

7. The wife of the chief king Justinian (The chief king is one of the two kings, Rome and Constantinople, that is, of the two kings, the chief one) was the famous hetaera Theodora. (A little higher, another source calls her prostitute No. 1). In Procopius' description, Theodora is the empress of Rome. Procopius wrote correctly, but later, her temporary husband was inserted into the story in her place, and he was even credited with founding the justice system. But, most likely, Theodora was also the high priestess of a "pagan temple”, similar to Cybele (see the book).

8. Three goddesses argue over which of them is better, more beautiful. Paris chooses Aphrodite. And so the Trojan War began. But Aphrodite was not only a goddess, but also a normal, living queen. After all, back then, and even later, in Ancient Rome, the "offices" of king and god were combined. Later, they were recast as "only" goddesses. But if the Trojan War, according to the "new chronologists”, corresponds to the Tarquinian, Gothic, and Crusader Wars, then all these queens should be chronologically pulled back to the 14th-15th centuries. Isn't that right?

9. Having insulted his wife, King Candaules signs his own death warrant. His wife, noticing the presence of her lover Gyges in her bedroom, forces him to kill her husband, the king. A change in the royal dynasty occurs. The woman behaves normally, as befits an all-powerful queen in a matriarchal system.

10. In the 14th century, there is the famous woman Matilda, wife of Louis of Burgundy. During the second Persian invasion of Greece, "at the head of the Greek militias stood the talented general Maltiades, who had lived for a long time in Persia”. Matilda is victorious in the war, but her subsequent fate is tragic. The trial of Matilda. Miltiades is victorious in the war with the Persians, but his subsequent fate is tragic. The trial of Miltiades. "A female attendant of the temple of the underworld goddesses showed Miltiades sacred objects that no man should see" (Herodotus). The neochronists in this example were interested in the fact that the same incident was used repeatedly to inflate history and send inconvenient events back to

antiquity. I, however, was interested in the "woman question”. This example vividly illustrates that matriarchy still existed in the 14th century, at least in royal families. And it needed to be destroyed immediately. "Come, come, desired friend..”. called Poggio to Cosimo de' Medici.

I took this information from the works of Nosovsky and Fomenko. I call them sometimes "neochronists”, sometimes "neochronologists”. In addition, I'll cite information from Jones, "The Fall of the Ancient World":

11. "Constantine (the Great, founder of Constantinople) was the eldest son of Constantius by a servant named Helena. When Constantius became Caesar, he was forced to divorce Helena and marry Maximinus' daughter Theodora (note, Theodora again), and little Constantine was sent to be educated at the court of Diocletian”. It seems this is the same prostitute empress of Romea. And it wasn't emperors who reigned, but empresses.

12. "The invasion (of Attila) was prompted by the reckless act of Honoria, Valentinian III's sister, who, enraged at being married to a man she didn't love, sent Attila her ring and a letter asking for help”. Firstly, replacing Honoria with Honorius would be a piece of cake, especially since Honorius was already emperor. Secondly, it's a mere child's play, as if young Lady Clinton were to call on our army for help if, God forbid, the former US President were to marry her off to someone she didn't like.

13. When Zeno died, the right to choose an heir again passed to the Senate, which referred the matter to Empress Ariadne for consideration. Her choice fell on the elderly court official Anastasius, whom she married”. Again, everything is a hoax. Why the hell did the Senate "transfer the right" to a widow who wasn't smart enough to do it themselves? And she chose some old man of no family, and then married that old fool. She's a fool, and the entire Senate is a fool. This one incident, taken separately, might be credible. But this "incident" is already my thirteenth.

14. Justinian applied to land tenants (effectively slaves) the rule that children of free mothers received their freedom, even if their fathers were tenants. This is a very strong argument, categorically asserting that women are more important than men.

15. In the 12th century, the Parthenon functioned as a Latin temple to the Virgin Mary, meaning ancient Athena = the medieval Virgin Mary (built in 1363). The famous Parthenon, supposedly built in ancient times, then disappears from the historical scene for a long time until the Middle Ages, only reappearing in the 14th century CE under Nerio. Once again, the queen precedes the king.

16. Ancient historians make much of the Phoenician fleet's participation in the war of 490 BC. Phoenicia sided with Persia against Greece. But Phoenicia is medieval Venice. And ancient Persia is France. Margaret is transformed into the Persian Mardonius, the instigator and inspirer of the Greco-Persian Wars. Venice, with its fleet, supports the French-Persians. The key here is that the queen is once again transformed into the king.

I'll write it in bold: **In biblical history, there are no queens, only kings, as is customary for the Judeans**. Although I have no doubt that they were there, only a very long time ago, before they set out to conquer the world with trade and money. Therefore, they were very surprised by such "disorder" and, being intelligent and literate people, set about eradicating this filth, lest their wives take up emancipation. And I'll add, in normal letters, that the times of Moses are gradually approaching the times of Cosimo de' Medici, the time of the fight against witches.

Bracciolini and Ficchino were clever fellows, but still, you can't hide an awl in a sack.

6. Medici shoved the modern and real opposition into antiquity. So that it wouldn't interfere.

In the time of the Medici, there was no opposition. Such a thing simply couldn't exist. Before him, there was ecclesiastical opposition, from the very "before the common era". We just saw it, partially, of course. After him, there was opposition, beginning with Hus, Žižka, and Luther. And during the "Medici Principate" (1434 – 1537), for over 100 years, there was no philosophical or ecclesiastical opposition. Everyone was happy to buy indulgences, everyone read the only available philosopher, Nicholas of Cusa, a mathematician whose understanding of mathematics was less than that of a modern third-grader. Despite the fact that Euclid died several thousand years ago, algebra had long been known in the East, and at such a level that even today it requires no correction.

In my aforementioned book, I compared the teachings of Nicholas of Cusa (of Cusa) and Aristotle. They are supposedly separated by 1,785 years. Aristotle was born in 384 BC, Cusa in 1401, only 12 years younger than Cosimo himself. And, in my opinion, Cusa's philosophy seems like the babble of a first-grader compared to that of a tenth-grader, a winner of all sorts of competitions. But Aristotle, who supposedly lived 1,785 years earlier, not only looks like a tenth-grader but also gives a run for his money to established contemporary philosophers like Demin, for example, and to his contemporary critics like Cassidy. (Details in the book and the article "Mysticism").

Why the hell was Aristotle, a contemporary of Cosimo de' Medici, relegated so far back into antiquity? But Plato is the "ancient" founder of idealism, on which Christianity is based. And in order to send Christianity to Christ's birthday, we need to send its philosophical apologist there too, so they can meet. And Christ himself was sent there so that his "teaching" would be more ancient, supposedly time-tested. How "durable" will Christian ideology be if, say, it was created just two weeks ago? After all, at least a dozen such ideologies arise in the world every year. Read the newspapers. Almost every one of them has a new ideology on the subject of "how to live on". And Christianity is so confusing, indigestible, with gigantic logical, chronological, moral, astronomical, and other errors. And if it isn't "tested by time", it will be treated like an editorial in Pravda, or even worse. Or like the speeches of our rulers, who tell us every day, as soon as they do the slightest thing for the people, for example: "We've raised your pension by two rubles, with inflation at 20 percent. Next year we'll double it, and in five years, fiftyfold". After all, both we and they know perfectly well that an increase is actually a decrease, since bread has already gone up in price, and two rubles in "increase" won't even buy half a loaf. And the promise of "50 times" will never be fulfilled. That's what Christianity would be like if it suddenly jumped out of the box onto the people, brand new, fresh from the stamp the day before yesterday. But when you tell a child that they shouldn't "touch their penis with their hands, or it will fall off", and add that "it's always been that way", they understand instantly.

Oh, I forgot. Aristotle criticizes Plato. How can he criticize after almost 2,000 years? Aristotle must have been Plato's student, rebelling against his teacher. That's the mistake. Where have you ever seen a student criticize a teacher? A student can only "develop" his teachings, and nothing else. This is clear from historians. Just as their teachers drummed into them that history can only be tailored, so the historian-students continue, as if they were wearing horse blinders. And the blinders were actually invented precisely for this purpose, so that the horse would not look at the surrounding landscape, including mares, but would see only the long-trodden path. Returning to teachers and students in the sciences. Read the biographies. Almost always, one scholar quietly studies the works of another scholar, usually not their teacher. And they see flaws in logic. And they write about them. And thereby advance the science. And a student, especially a

diligent one, will never spot errors in the works of their idol. This is the rule. Exceptions are extremely rare. And the "resurrection" of Plato's works 2,000 years later in Cosimo de' Medici's Platonic Academy seems completely idiotic. It's the same as the resurrection, say, of matriarchy. Out of the blue.

Even more alarming is the fact that in the time of Cosimo de' Medici, not only individual scholars opposed to Christianity were completely absent, but entire heresies, sects, and so on. All of these were left behind by the 1300s. A thing of the past, so to speak. Yet even today, we see all around us ever new varieties of religious renegades. But in Cosimo's time, everything was a blank slate. A clean slate of Christianity, without a speck of dust. We should search for all of this in the centuries-old "bins", drag it out into the light, and return it all to its rightful place in the chronological scale.

Let's turn to the time when Christ had almost just been crucified. 160-180 AD. The reign of Marcus Aurelius, and a little earlier, under his adoptive father, Emperor Antoninus. I'll simply list the heresies (sects) from Renan's book that existed during that brief "moment" of time: the Valentinians, the School of Saturninus, the School of Carpocrates, the Church of Marcos, the Ophites, the Baptists or Sabians, the Gnostics, the Marcionite Church, the Dogma of Apelles, the Encratites, the Manichaeans, and the Montanists. I wouldn't say these heresies were all that different from each other. For example, according to Tatian, "the consumption of meat and wine made a person unclean. He demanded that only water be used in the sacraments". But even today, if we take a sober look at the issue, Catholicism differs from Orthodoxy by the two-fingered sign of the cross versus the three-fingered sign of the cross. Speaking of Baptists, Christianity itself has become unrecognizable in 1300 years, while the Baptist heresy has remained monolithic throughout all these centuries. Is that really so?

Here's how Celsus reasoned, according to Renan, supposedly 1,300 years before Cosimo de' Medici: "Providence, divination, temple miracles, oracles, the immortality of the soul, future rewards and punishments seem to be integral parts of **the state doctrine**". Or this characterization of Celsus: "Celsus is most striking in his exegesis. **Voltaire himself is no better at demolishing biblical history**: the impossibility of the book of Genesis, understood in its literal sense, the naive childishness of stories about the creation of the world, the flood, Noah's ark. The bloody, cruel, egotistical nature of Jewish history is vividly exposed, as is the strangeness of the divine choice that favored such a people and called them the people of God. The malice of Jewish ridicule of other sects is sharply condemned as an expression of injustice and pride". Then he quotes Celsus: "The Jews and the Christians seem to me like a flock of bats or ants crawling out of their hole, or frogs in a swamp, or worms sitting in a corner of a quagmire… and speaking in such words: "God reveals and announces everything to us beforehand; he does not care about the rest of the world; **he leaves the heavens and the earth to revolve** as they please, and is concerned only with us. We are the only beings with whom he communicates by means of messengers, the only ones with whom he wishes to be acquainted, because he created us in his own image. Everything is subject to us: earth, water, air and stars; everything was created for us and destined to serve us; and since some of us happened to sin, God himself will come, or send his own son, to burn up the wicked and allow us, together with him, to enjoy eternal life".

People couldn't have reasoned like that 1300 years before the Medici, reasoning that even Voltaire would have envied, and then it all sank into oblivion. I'll continue until you understand this too: "The appearance of God in the person of Jesus seems indecent and useless to our philosopher. The miracles of the Gospels are pitiful; wandering sorcerers do the same, and no one considers them sons of God. The life of Jesus is the life of a pitiful miracle worker, hated by God. His character is irritable; his abrupt manner of

speaking betrays a man incapable of persuasion; it is not befitting a god, nor even a sane person”. Or this: "If God wished to save the human race, why did he send his son to only one corner of the world? He should have put his spirit into several bodies and sent these heavenly messengers in different directions, since he knew that the one sent to the Jews would be killed. Why, then, two opposing revelations, that of Moses and that of Jesus? Jesus, they say, rose from the dead? The same is said of many others, Zamolsis, Pythagoras, Rhampsinites. Alive, he could do nothing for himself; but dead, you say, he rose again and showed signs of his suffering, holes in his hands. But who saw all this? A woman, mentally ill, as you yourself admit, or any other possessed person of the same kind. Apparently, the Son of God himself was not strong enough to leave the tomb; it was necessary for another to roll away the stone... If Jesus had truly wished to reveal his divine being, he should have shown himself to his enemies, to the judge who sentenced him, and to all the people. His execution had countless witnesses, his resurrection – only one”. One could go on and on. I will conclude with the following phrase: "But still, faith must be based on reason, and not have as its sole foundation a determination not to discuss anything”.

Perhaps you, staunch believers in official history, won't believe my seemingly slippery arguments. Then I'll provide a logical proof. Do you know when Copernicus was born? If not, I'll tell you—in 1473, 84 years younger than Cosimo de' Medici. Before Copernicus, no one knew that the Earth rotates on its axis and moves around the Sun. And Celsus, as if it were self-evident, states almost casually: "H**e (God) intends the heavens and the earth to revolve**”, as if unaware that "this has not yet been discovered by science”. Someone might respond to this proof—I've seen it myself in print—by saying that the heliocentric system was somehow already known in Ancient Egypt, or somewhere around it. And then it was forgotten. Firstly, humanity, for some reason, has never forgotten anything it knew, so it wouldn't have forgotten the heliocentric system either. Secondly, humanity invented the steam locomotive and the steamship 330 years after Copernicus' birth. So why the hell didn't the ancient Egyptians invent the steam locomotive and the steamship before our era? About three thousand years ago, 330 years after they discovered the Earth was round.

Finally, I barely learned to read the cited Renan book in a reprint, with Russian letters, which I simply didn't recognize. But this book couldn't have been published before 1860, when Renan was elected a full member of the Russian Academy of Sciences. (There's no date on the title page of N. Glagolev's publishing house.) That's what a hundred years of history is. Our historians, however, throw thousands of years around, and the historical figures they tell us force us to think in a completely contemporary way. This was also evident to attentive readers in Bracciolini's forgeries. And I casually noticed Celsus' statement about the Earth's rotation, which Renan had overlooked.

7. The Question of Easter and the Gregorian Calendar

It's not without reason that I singled out the year the Gregorian calendar was adopted—1582, 122 years after the death of Cosimo de' Medici. These blockheads had to switch from October 4th straight to October 15th. Although the blockheads were those who introduced Christianity with Easter on a Sunday, rather than on any day of the week, as long as it coincided with the first full moon after the vernal equinox, as the Jews did.

Renan describes this story so childishly that it's laughable: "The Jewish calendar was complicated, and in countries where there were no Jews, determining the 14th of Nisan would have been difficult. It was agreed that the Resurrection of Christ should be celebrated on the Sunday coinciding with or following the first full

moon after the vernal equinox”. And again: "The Easter cycle was so poorly calculated that neighboring churches, for example those of Alexandria and Palestine, would dissolve in the spring in order to agree to celebrate the feast on the same day in complete harmony. How strange, indeed, to see one church mourning, exhausted by fasting, while another church was already giving itself over to the joys of the resurrection! The abstinence from food, which preceded Easter and led to the institution of Lent, was also applied in the most varied ways”.

Why is it so difficult to determine the 14th day of a 28-day lunar month without Jews? The 14th day is simply a full moon, visible in the sky even without Jews. The problem is that Jews celebrate their Passover on this very day; they look at the sky and celebrate. Nisan is the first lunar month after the vernal equinox. Determining the equinox is also easy. Stick a stick in the ground and draw a circle around it. When the sun's shadow from sunrise to sunset coincides with the diameter, that's the equinox. You just have to wait for the full moon after that, so it will be brighter to celebrate. You only have to wait a few days. You could celebrate on the equinox itself, but not everyone understands sundials to determine it. So, word gets out that the equinox has arrived, so keep an eye on the sky, make sure there's a full moon. It's all very simple and straightforward. It's no wonder this is the most ancient of all holidays. Initially, it was simply a Semitic spring festival (paskh), then a celebration of the exodus from Egypt. There's no need to invent something new for Christians. That's how it was at first: Christians celebrated Passover together with the Judeans, on the same day. Only the Judeans no longer celebrated a spring festival, but the exodus from Egypt, while Christians celebrated the resurrection of their beloved Christ.

Wait. How about the Resurrection, but not on Sunday? And can you find even one Western European chronicle or myth that mentions the days of the week? After all, the days of the week actually originated from the names of the planets, when attention was first paid to them—that is, when astrology emerged. And how could it have arisen in Western Europe, where the sky is covered by clouds almost year-round? The Jews, however, lived where the sun shone year-round, and the stars shone at night. So they decided that Saturday was a day off, and all other days were workdays. This is in addition to the dates and months—note, lunar months with 28 days, not solar months like we all have today. Christ, when he introduced the "First Law" (also known as Deuteronomy), discarded by the Jews as unnecessary, into our daily lives, didn't even know that we don't have days of the week as such. But he died quickly, and Christianity went into disarray. There were no literate Christians at all, only power-hungry goddess-mothers who later became popes. Gradually, of course, they learned, but, as they say, something and somehow, that is, little by little and in a jumbled way, from the fifth to the tenth. Today, they would certainly say they lacked a "systematic education”.

When they finally learned about the days of the week, they were horrified. How could this be? It couldn't be that Christ was crucified today and then resurrected today. Moreover, the Gospels had already been written, and in such a way that even the devil himself couldn't figure it out—as I say, they were illiterate. According to Matthew, Christ "ate the Passover with his disciples on the 14th of Nisan (during the full moon) before his death. Thus, they celebrated this day together with the Jews, no matter what day of the week it fell on”. Renan: "The Apostle John celebrated the Passover on the 14th of Nisan throughout his life, but in the Gospel attributed to him, he apparently preaches an entirely different teaching, disdains the ancient Jewish celebration of Passover, and coincides with the death of Jesus on the very day when the lamb was eaten, as if indicating its replacement with a new Passover lamb”. Renan is being disingenuous; his "seemingly indicates" actually indicates nothing. That is, not a single Gospel explicitly states when

Christians should celebrate Passover. And this, you see, is a call to dissent. In short, Catholics logically concluded that they should celebrate not Christ's murder, but his resurrection. It was at this time that they discovered that there were also days of the week, which the Jews had long had. But they immediately became confused; they were not yet accustomed to identifying days of the week with calendar dates. Moreover, in their foggy twilight, they were completely ignorant of astrology, from which astronomy arose. Nevertheless, they designated Sunday as the day of the sun, under the sign of Christ's birth, and Saturday, naturally, as the sign of Saturn (Saturday). The Russians, being the most latecomers, simply renumbered the days of the week, with the exception of Sunday, to which they ascribed the required meaning.

This is where the Christians were truly horrified. And they immediately corrected it with, so to speak, an apostolic decree, which consisted of two points: 1) do not celebrate with the Judeans, 2) celebrate only after the vernal equinox. And I would have done the same if I hadn't studied astronomy in school. I would have thought, too, let the Judeans crucify Christ first. Imagine, they thought that the Judean Passover was celebrated on the equinox. So they thought they could get away with these two points. But that's not the only reason. Christians simply didn't know when the equinox would be; for them, the sun is always behind the clouds. They thought, "We'll see the Judeans celebrate, and we'll celebrate in two or three days". Then it turned out that the Judeans celebrate not on the equinox, but on the full moon after the equinox—the first full moon, at that. The apostles immediately issued a decree with a third rule: 3) "celebrate the Passover after the first full moon", meaning slightly after the Jewish Passover, given the second point. How could the evangelists possibly keep up with these apostolic decrees? They wrote their Gospels and died. Control passed entirely to the apostles. It's not for nothing that they joke in Rus': "Why are you standing there like an apostle, like a wooden post?" In all fairness, the first point could have been discarded, consigned to the archives; it had become unnecessary after the introduction of the third point. Why specify that "butter is butter?" They didn't remove it, afraid of making a mistake: you never know.

But again, some uncertainty arose. After the first full moon, which occurs after the vernal equinox, who knows how many days remain, so you could reach a new equinox, the autumnal one, and even the vernal one, but from the other side, so to speak. This is where they applied their newfound knowledge of the days of the week: they designated one day of the week, in Hebrew, as the day of the sun, the day of Christ. These were the advanced peoples, while the backward ones immediately called it resurrection, as I already said. And immediately a clause appeared in the rules regarding Passover: 4) "...but not on any day, but on the first Sunday after the full moon". Do you see how sharply they curtailed the attempts to celebrate Passover from the old to the new, the entire year? I wondered if they, the Christians, had known about Sunday before, would they have included it as the fourth clause? After all, they weren't exactly fools, they were simply illiterate. They could have easily written it down right away, if they had known the days of the week: if Jewish Passover falls on a Sunday, then we celebrate it on the following Sunday. May Christ not be offended and hang for a week. You can't command the sun, even though Your Father hung it. If the Jews don't celebrate Passover on a Sunday, then we celebrate it on the first available Sunday, and You, our Double-God, will have less time to hang, again depending on the sun. That's how Your Father created it.

But here again a snag arose. Had Christ the Jew lived, he would have quickly figured it out; he was very literate, after all, even though he hated the "scribes" along with the "Pharisees". The thing is, the moon is rarely visible in our region, and this idiotic equinox can easily be missed. So they developed a drawing, the so-called "Jewish hand circles of the moon", in the form of a human palm, by the phalanges of whose fingers the Jews used to determine their Passover when the moon was not visible. They are, after all, a

nomadic trading tribe, and at the right time, business can take them who knows where. And next to this "Jewish" hand, they drew their own, with exactly the same phalanges, only the inscriptions were different, this time for their own "native" Easter, that is, shifted accordingly by days. Their own hand was called the Damascene hand, and the Jewish one remained with the inscription "Jewish". The two hands together were called the Paschalia. And they lived happily according to this hand, paying no attention to astronomy at all. Just note that the Christians couldn't do without the "Jewish hand"; it was there as a sort of control. This means they themselves had no idea what they were doing. They did everything purely mechanically, without delving into the essence. And this is what let the Christians down.

The thing is, the man who compiled this "Jewish hand" was an astronomer, and the "hand" was constantly being adjusted as new knowledge was acquired and old ones refined. But Christians thought this "hand" was eternal, bestowed directly upon the Jews by God. And it would remain in effect until the end of time. And once, they almost celebrated their Passover at the same time as the Jewish one. The Jews adjusted their dates and didn't tell the Christians. Having gotten a bit adept at celebrating Passover, the Christians decided to create their own 12-month calendar (the Julian calendar) and transferred all the Jewish Passover days into it, and then figured out how to align their own. And they became very proud, saying, "We're the ones with the mustache and live by our own calendar". But they still didn't bother keeping track of the moon and sun because of bad weather. And they were disappointed again.

Here we need to stop and ask how many years it takes to master the art of sculpting your own calendar. I mention this deliberately, lest you think it takes 2,000 years. For example, the "moon's cycle" repeats in 19-year cycles, but with a small increment, so that a whole day accumulates over three hundred years. Similarly, a leap day accumulates over four years, and not exactly four. The Julian calendar, however, didn't take this increment into account. Therefore, the Jewish and Christian Passovers began to move closer together. This was noticed in the 14th century, shortly before the birth of the Medici. The error in Christian Passover due to the shift in the true full moon reached two days. That is, "if the Jewish Passover falls on Saturday, then, according to the 4th rule, the Christian Passover should be celebrated the following day—Sunday". But because of the resulting two-day shift, the Paschalia will determine the celebration of Easter on the first Sunday after the full moon, that is, a week later, on the following Sunday" (Nosovsky, Fomenko). Therefore, the 4th rule is violated, and this is completely impossible in religion. The patience of the Christian hierarchs was running out. This damned "wandering" Easter did not want to serve them. How wonderful it would be if Easter were celebrated like May 1st, January 1st, or, at the very least, February 23rd – Defender of the Fatherland Day, when women carry pickles to work and men empty their "stashes" for vodka.

But that's not all. The Medici Church was built like a division on a parade ground, the "Roman" treasury was overflowing, and the devil knows what was going on in the parishes and bishoprics. See the quote from Renan above on this matter. Some haven't even finished Lent, while others are already sobering up. It's disgusting to watch, as Arkady Raikin used to say. But before the poor fellow could, he died, overworked organizing the church and falsifying history in his, or rather, "Plato's" academy. But I have no doubt that in his will, although I haven't read it, he ordered this misunderstanding, which constantly led the hierarchs into trouble, to be corrected.

The time came soon. In 1582, Pope Gregory XIII issued a bull: "Among our most important concerns was not only to restore the equinox to its anciently appointed place, from which it had drifted approximately ten days since the Council of Nicaea, and to restore the fourteenth moon (full moon) to its place, from which it drifts four and five days, but also to establish a method and rules by which it will be ensured that in the

future the equinox and the fourteenth moon never move from their places”. Therefore, in order to restore the vernal equinox to its former place, which the Fathers of the Council of Nicaea established on the 12th day before the Kalends of April (March 21), we decree and command concerning the month of October of the present year 1582, that ten days, from the third day before the Nones (October 5) to the eve of the Ides (October 14) inclusive, be removed”.

Nosovsky and Fomenko comment on this papal decision: "Thus, the Gregorian calendar “overtakes” the Julian calendar by three days every four hundred years. By now, the difference between them is no longer 10, but 13 days. <…> In fact, tying the vernal equinox to March 21st has no practical or scientific significance. Moreover, it leads to certain practical inconveniences associated with the inevitable unevenness of the historical scale based on such a calendar. It's no wonder the Julian calendar is still used in astronomical calculations”. How is this "of no practical significance"? Of course it does. Papa ordered not only that the equinox must be fixed in place, but that "the 14th moon (full moon) never move from its place..”. It would have been, as I said above, Easter—on a specific day on the calendar, for example, on Lenin's birthday or death (I think it was April 22nd, I've forgotten, I've been trying to remember it for 40 years).

Here, a digression is necessary for clarity. Don't we know that sometimes people demand "to dig it up from under the ground”, "to have it ready by May 1st”, "that the parallel lines that intersect near the Andromeda nebula intersect right here, in my office”. Or, in fact, make me an atomic bomb like the Americans have for the 70th anniversary of the birth of the leader of the world proletariat. Of course, they'll do it; if they don't, they'll steal it. And note that not a single big boss ever demanded that two and two equal five. He knows perfectly well that it's impossible. But he knows nothing else, and that's why he demands it. So, Pope Gregory XIII adopted the "Gregorian" calendar. It sounds so beautiful, so resonant. But the Patriarch of Moscow still counts years "from the creation of the world”, with over 6,000 already accumulated. And among Muslims, years haven't even crossed the 2,000 mark, not to mention lingering somewhere in the 14th or 15th century.

Therefore, Nosovsky and Fomenko's explanations are useful only to us, not to the popes: "But the task of correcting the Paschalia—as formulated in the bull—is insoluble! The fact is that the vernal equinox and the first spring full moon shift across the calendar at different rates. Therefore, it is impossible to stop them once and for all by changing the average length of the calendar year. Which, of course, immediately became apparent after the Gregorian reform. The first full moon of spring began to shift in the Gregorian calendar one and a half times faster than in the Julian calendar, and even in the opposite direction. As a result, as a price for literal adherence to the 4th canon of the Gregorian Paschal calendar, the 2nd (apostolic) canon on Easter (only after the vernal equinox—mine) was violated. Thus, the vernal equinox was moved to March 21st, "back to its proper place”. And to prevent further accumulation of errors, it was decided to subtract three days from every four hundred years.

But I didn't write all this to report on the stupidities of the popes, or the initial confusion over the Christian celebration of Easter before and after the Julian calendar. I didn't mean to point out that without the Jewish calendar, Christians couldn't take a single step. I want to ask again the rhetorical question that sounded somewhat unclear to me above. Could Christians have been so confused since 1582? And only then accepted what they considered a radical solution to the Gregorian reform? As a guide, I offer the following revolutions, carried out not when life was no longer possible, but promptly, as the situation demanded.

The Y2K problem in the computer world was solved ahead of time, radically, and virtually without failure, even on gigantic networks. Another example: overcoming a dead end in aircraft manufacturing, when engine weight and the required aircraft speed conflicted. The "dead end" was that even an empty aircraft wouldn't be able to lift its engine at supersonic speeds. They immediately focused so heavily on streamlining that the problem was solved almost instantly. And the automobile? That steam-powered monster, like a "perpetual motion machine", should have forever remained a curiosity. But the enormous effort to perfect a seemingly completely hopeless invention made possible the volumes of their production that exist worldwide today. Not to mention that a modern desktop Pentium would barely fit in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses if it still relied on vacuum tubes. And it wouldn't be able to run continuously for even 20 seconds before failing. What does this mean?

This suggests that religions could not have existed for as long as history ascribes to them. Gutenberg's press simply allowed Catholic popes to compile facts gleaned at random from ancient manuscripts, present them 5-10 times under various guises, and tie them to a "chronological" scale of 10,000 years instead of 1,000. And then, irrevocably canonize all this nonsense on Gutenberg's press.

The Ptolemies, the Clock, Easter, and the Gregorian Calendar

I examined the calendrical embodiment of Easter and the Gregorian church calendar itself in detail in my article "The Renaissance as a Triumph of Obscurantism (the Medici and Company, Gutenberg, and Other "Greeks") in subsection "7. The Question of Easter and the Gregorian Calendar". The overall result of this examination is utter nonsense. I won't repeat this here, but I will outline the main conclusions I was able to reach.

Christ could, of course, have risen on Sunday, but it's impossible to tie this day of the week to a specific date on the calendar; days of the week shift across the calendar. Therefore, according to the Julian calendar, Christian Easter began to occur before the Judean Passover. As a result, Christ was resurrected before he was killed. Roughly speaking, ten days had to be removed from the Julian calendar, moving directly from October 4 to October 15, 1582. And now Christian Easter no longer catches up with the Judean Passover, but lags behind it. But that's not the point. The point is that Christ is not supposed to rise again before the Jews crucify him. The idiotic side effect of the Gregorian calendar is that astronomers don't use it, as it's so bizarre it's impossible, and calculating all sorts of celestial astronomical predictions from it is mind-boggling. But we live by this calendar today and seem to notice nothing. You and I don't calculate when, for example, Halley's Comet will approach us again. We find out from the newspapers.

But the main conclusion isn't that. The main point is that Western Europe, even at the end of the 16th century, when the Renaissance was almost over, was woefully ignorant of astronomy. And it acquired all its knowledge in the East, in the Middle East. And because it was illiterate, it misused what it did acquire like the worst of losers. But all of world history was written in the West, with some parts, often inappropriately, borrowed from Eastern history. Therefore, it turned out to be just as lopsided as the Gregorian calendar and the Christian Easter, especially the Catholic one. I'm telling you this by way of introduction, so you understand: not only does Ptolemaic geocentrism, which I'll now turn to, seem like an artificial construct, and which could not have been "invented" without knowledge of the operating principle of a mechanical pendulum clock. And since the heliocentric system of the world is simply a mechanical clock, this very geocentric system of Ptolemy could not have been constructed before the invention of clocks.

I now have a reasonable suspicion that the heliocentric system of the world was created first, and then the geocentric one. Just as the Judean Passover was first established on the first full moon after the vernal equinox, and then the four famous Christian "rules about Passover" were tacked on, thus confusing all calendars.

First, about Claudius Ptolemy, the "Greek", who, as you already know, were not Greeks at all, but Jews. Claudius Ptolemy supposedly lived most of his life in Alexandria, which, as we know, was founded by Alexander the Great near the mouth of the Nile. I believe (see my book) that Alexandria was founded spontaneously because it had table salt—the very first "universal equivalent" on Earth—almost on the surface. Information about this Ptolemy's life is "very scant", so how he got from Greece to Egypt is unknown. But all his works have survived, and there are quite a few of them. The Algamest in 13 volumes, the Geography in 8 books, and 5 volumes on optics. And they're all sitting neatly on the shelves. This wouldn't be so strange if the same thing hadn't happened to the three Platos I wrote about in my book. And I rightly said there that these same Platos lived no earlier than Cosimo de' Medici himself, in the 15th century, all three of them. And they wrote for him. I want to say the same about Claudius Ptolemy, who, to please the Catholic Church, reworked the well-known heliocentric system of the universe into a geocentric one, with the center in magma. This Ptolemy allegedly lived between 90 and 160 AD.

But here's the strange thing. This "Greek from Egypt" did, after all, write in Arabic: the Great Soviet Encyclopedia shamefacedly calls "Algamest" "arabized", and five "Ptolemaic" volumes on optics were actually "discovered" in 1801 as translations from Arabic.

I'll move on to the Ptolemaic family, which had nothing in common with Claudius Ptolemy but also lived in Egypt. The founder of the Egyptian dynasty, Ptolemy I, was Alexander the Great's general and inherited Egypt from him. Just as other rulers inherited other provinces of the First World Empire, which, of course, never existed, as I've proven repeatedly in my works. How did the Ptolemies begin their rule in Egypt? By "introducing the cult of Serapis". What is known about Serapis is that, like Attis, he was a youthful god who was the lover of his mother, a true goddess, in all respects, as befits a matriarchy. (See the book, section "Gods and Incest"). Here are excerpts from their dynasty:

- Ptolemy II Philadelpheus (sister-loving), 285 – 246 BC.
- Ptolemy IV Philopator (father-loving), 221 – 204 BC.
- Ptolemy V Epiphanes (manifest god), ascended the throne as a minor, 204 – 180 BC.
- Ptolemy VI Philometor (mother-loving), 180 – 145 BC.
- Ptolemy VIII Euergetes, nicknamed Physcon, the Pot-Bellied, 170 – 116 BC. He is the brother of Philometor, "the mother-loving one", and is at war with him for some unknown reason. But he not only has a brother, Euergetes, but also a sister, Cleopatra II, who is also his wife. He also wars with her.
- Ptolemy Cleopatra III, the second wife of the same Pot-Bellied, is at war with her sons.

206 years later, Claudius Ptolemy will be born, who has no relation to these "namesakes", but also lives in Alexandria. But that's not the point. First, look in my book, at the aforementioned section "Gods and Incest", then there, or in the article "The Renaissance as a Triumph of Obscurantism", in the section "Brief Women's Histories", and then read on. And it will become clear that we're talking about queens here, aka mother goddesses. Only later, where possible, they were transformed into men, and where absolutely

impossible, they remained queens. And "loving" one's mother, father, and sisters isn't familial platonic love at all, but purely sexual, from which children will be born.

Why have I strayed so far from the main topic? To show that everything described here about incestuous relationships took place not before the Common Era, although at its very end, but during the time of Cosimo de' Medici, and even a little later. Why? Because the famous "Malleus"—the church's manual on combating witches—was published several times more often than the Bible itself from 1486 to 1600 (114 years), 28 times. And the "works" of Claudius Ptolemy, promoting the geocentric system of the universe, were published from 1475 to 1600 (almost the same 125 years)—42 times. Ten times more often than the Bible, which was first printed in 1455. By this, I mean that all the "works" of Ptolemy the scholar were not published before 1475. And they flooded the entire Catholic world, completely displacing previous knowledge of the heliocentric system of the universe.

Here I want to once again recall Nicholas of Cusa, the bishop who so idiotically "proved" using mathematics that there is a Catholic God (more details in the book). I wouldn't have even thought of him if it weren't for the years he lived. Well, he lived from 1401 to 1464 and died in the same year as Cosimo de' Medici. I'll just note here that if we compare his works with those of Aristotle, who supposedly lived almost 1800 years before Cusa, the logic in these works can only be compared by comparing the logic of a three-year-old in kindergarten with that of a student who just received his high school diploma, or even a graduate of physics and mathematics. Cusa deliberately degraded science to suit the Catholic religion. And this couldn't have happened, or rather, it shouldn't have happened, if true science hadn't been sufficiently developed, but within a narrow circle of scientists—that is, hadn't been widely disseminated. And it was precisely pseudoscience that began to be disseminated through printing. That's why the sciences and arts, they say, have degenerated, something that can't happen in nature. And even today, in Russia, among a nation downtrodden and morally and spiritually exhausted, science isn't degenerating; it simply exists in a very limited number of minds. Most people feed their minds from television and newspapers, and drink vodka. And they don't even want to reproduce.

I'll move on to other evidence. Through an oversight, the encyclopedia included information that Ptolemy, in his "Geography", "designated the latitude and longitude coordinates of 8,000 geographical features. In latitude—from Scandinavia to the Upper Nile, in longitude—from the Atlantic to Indochina". Moreover, he did this "not from astronomical definitions, but based on merchant routes". And here I want to point out three idiotic points that follow from these few words. First, if Ptolemy determined coordinates by latitude and longitude, then he undoubtedly knew that the Earth is round. And that the Moon and Sun are round is clear even without binoculars. Therefore, the planets are also round. He would have to be an absolute fool to consider the Earth the center of the universe, since planets, as few people know even today, move not in circles, but in loops. Which proves that the center of the universe is the Sun. It's just that whoever wrote Ptolemy's "Geography" for him was ordered to prove that the Earth is the center of the universe. Just as the Emperor of Cusa was ordered to "prove" the existence of God mathematically.

Secondly, after mentioning 8,000 coordinates, they realised their mistake. How could they possibly have done that? It's impossible to determine them without astronomical observations, at least the angular altitude of the North Star? And they covered up this oversight with another idiotic tactic: "merchants' tales". But what could the merchants have told them if they were sailing along the coast and from island to island in direct line of sight? They couldn't even orient the coastline to the cardinal directions, since they had no watches. Besides, the coastline is so winding, as you can see from the map. And without a primitive sextant

and a similar chronometer, nothing could be done. So the merchants couldn't tell Ptolemy anything about the coordinates; as for geography, they could only tell him what their unaided eyes saw.

Thirdly, I really liked the encyclopedia's clarification regarding longitude, precisely defining it as "from the Atlantic to Indochina". But this zone of Ptolemaic knowledge about the Earth coincides precisely with the spread of Islam, which still exists here today. And the "merchant-storytellers" are clearly present here too, only with primitive sextants and chronometers. This is the trading tribe from the desert on the border of Yemen and Saudi Arabia—the first professional traders on Earth, whose entire life, from the time they emerged from their desert to the seashore, was connected with water. This is why all the works of the "Greek" Ptolemy turned out to be "Arabized". I have so many works on the origins of the Jews, including a book, that I will not dwell on this issue here.

According to the encyclopedia, there is another peculiarity of the Ptolemaic books. It turns out that "astronomical observations were dated by the years of the kings' reigns, which became the source of chronology". In other words, Ptolemy supposedly timed his observed celestial phenomena to a specific reign. So, firstly, he didn't draw his maps based on merchants' accounts, but on his own astronomical observations. And secondly, how could he have carried out his observations over the reign of an entire dynasty? A lifetime wouldn't have been enough. It turns out that Ptolemy summarized his earlier observations. So where are their remains? After all, Ptolemy's books have all survived, but his sources have not. That can't be right. Most likely, all the primary sources of the mythical "Ptolemy" were destroyed and replaced by his "own" works, widely distributed by the printing press, which turned the entire cosmogony on its head. I'll elaborate on this below, but for now, let me remind you that Scaliger, the founder of modern chronology, lived from 1540 to 1609 and invented his chronology no earlier than 1600. Nicolaus Copernicus wrote his book "On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres", in which he formulated the heliocentric system, in 1543, when Scaliger was only three years old. The Inquisition's decree banning Copernican doctrine was somewhat belated, appearing only in 1616, seven years after Scaliger's death. Galileo's trial for Copernican doctrine was scheduled even later, in 1632, almost a century after Copernicus wrote his book. The key point here is that Scaliger's "invention" of the chronology that remains in use today practically coincided with the banning of Copernican doctrine and the mass printing of the Ptolemaic worldview, which, in turn, provided Scaliger with a "source for the chronology of the reigns of kings".

If you think about it carefully and objectively, it turns out that the Ptolemaic "teaching" was specifically created somewhere around the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries, so that it could later be used as a basis for the creation of a new chronology. And in order to place the Earth and the one Catholic god located somewhere within its "spheres" at the head of all rationality in the Universe. That's why nothing of this teaching has been lost. How could it be lost if forty editions are undertaken in just over a century? And forty editions are undertaken so that everyone will forget about the Copernican teaching (which, in fact, isn't really Copernican, but an earlier one). And note how the Catholic clergy constantly lags behind the demands of the times. They abandoned their "Ptolemaic" teaching only under pressure from Kepler. They began holding discos in churches only when young people stopped going there altogether. In my opinion, the time has come to abolish celibacy, otherwise bishops have completely switched to educating homosexuals. Obscurantism always gives way very slowly. It's evident in the Soviet Union and in Russia as a whole.

I also note that Copernican doctrine arose in the very place in Europe where the bloodiest battles against Cosimo de' Medici's Catholicism took place. And from there, in fact, came first Protestantism, then the Reformation, and finally the Enlightenment. But it didn't originate there, this doctrine; it was everywhere,

especially in Arabia, many centuries earlier. Only in Poland and Germany was it not eradicated as it had been in Italy, and it resurfaced in the 16th and later centuries. But that's not all.

I will examine the kinematics of Ptolemaic and Copernican doctrine. Ptolemy didn't invent his own universe, but supposedly borrowed its foundations from Aristotle. The planets move across the Earth's sky in such a complex, looping motion that describing this motion while making Earth the center of the universe is no simple task. But it had to be done; the popes, led by the Medici, demanded it. Just as Pope Gregory demanded the introduction of the Gregorian calendar. Therefore, it is clear that without the development of solid geometry and the kinematics of rotational motion, this would have been impossible. And in Ptolemy's time, where he was thrust, solid geometry and kinematics as such did not yet exist.

Here I must turn to clocks that keep time. I will not consider sundials and water clocks, but will turn directly to mechanical clocks, whose design strongly resembles the kinematics of a heliocentric universe. As for a geocentric universe (for example, using the axis of the minute hand as the center of motion instead of the axis of a spring), it is practically impossible to express it in gears even today. In any case, it's extremely complex in terms of kinematics and spatial understanding.

We're told that "the origin of mechanical clocks is unknown" (Britannica), although the first known mechanical clock appeared in Milan in 1335. Note that this was 1184 years after Ptolemy's creation of the unimaginably complex kinematics of the solar system with the origin at the center of the Earth. And this Milan clock is so primitive that it's not even worth mentioning, as it lacked a pendulum—the sole basis of all mechanical clocks to this day (the pendulum itself, or so-called balance—is a twisted spring, which is also a pendulum). And the law of the pendulum was discovered only by Galileo in 1582, and its application to clocks was substantiated by Huygens in 1656 (Britannica). The hour hand appeared on clocks in 1500, and the minute hand in the late 17th century.

What am I trying to say with these examples? The idea that the creation of an incredibly more complex system for calculating planetary motion in the Ptolemaic system, with the center of the universe on Earth, compared to the Copernican system, could not have been achieved before the invention of clocks. Only when people realized that the universe was heliocentric could they have conceived the idea of making mechanical clocks. And not a day earlier. As for the geocentric system of the world according to Ptolemy, it could not have been created before the invention of mechanical clocks with gears, but rather much later. That was when mechanical clocks became so kinematically complex that, in addition to telling time, they began to perform complex mechanical performances, beginning with the simple "cuckoo”. From a kinematic perspective, mechanical clocks with "bells and whistles" are the transformation of rotational motion into swinging motion along an arc and reciprocating motion. And vice versa. Only in this way can the "loops" of planetary orbits on the Earth's celestial sphere be interpreted in kinematics.

I want to say that without the invention of kinematically complex clocks, there would have been no point in even attempting to understand the kinematics of the solar system centered on Earth—that is, the Ptolemaic system of the universe. And this should be clear to anyone with even a passing understanding of kinematics.

I'll mention Nicholas of Cusa again. He certainly knew a little mathematics. But what a struggle it was for him to apply it to proving the existence of God! And he still couldn't do it without falsifying elementary mathematical concepts. It would have been impossible for "Ptolemy" to create his "universe" without knowing the operating principle of mechanical clocks. And these two examples alone show how low people

have sunk, passing off obscurantism as science. And why was this necessary? It was necessary so that everyone would pray and believe in one God. And why was this necessary? So that people would think alike, and not only think alike, but also act alike. And what was the purpose of this? To create a global empire. Did it work? No, it didn't, and it never will. The Soviet Union is a case in point, not to mention earlier Islam, and a little later, the Catholic Empire. And Hitler's "Aryan" empire. All of these empires had their own ideology, which was as obscurantist as the "Ptolemaic" system of the world and the Scaligerian chronology, which came to light at the height of the implementation of Cosimo de' Medici's "ideas".

Let's return to the kinematics of the "Ptolemaic" system of the world. To describe this kinematics, it was necessary to create 56 spheres, one within another, for the seven planets, including the Sun and Moon, rotating uniformly, and the resultant of all these movements created the "loops" in the Earth's sky. Moreover, the relative tilts of the axes of rotation of these spheres and the rotation speeds were "selected" (the encyclopedia says so directly) for each planet separately. And this already looks very much like a mechanical clock with an opening door, a cuckoo protruding from it: "coo-coo-coo..". But all this kinematics still didn't produce equivalent "loops" in the Earth's sky, which the planets themselves draw and people observe. Therefore, Ptolemy introduced so-called epicycles, where a planet moves along the last of them, and the center of each preceding epicycle moves along the circumference of the previous epicycle. "The angles of inclination of the planes of the differentials (the circumferences of the preceding epicycles-spheres) and the epicycles of the planets themselves, and their relative radii and angular velocities of movement along them, were selected to best describe the apparent motion of the planets across the sky", the encyclopedia writes. This is why 56 spheres were required for the seven planets, I would add.

And this isn't just a cuckoo clock. It's a royal clock, whose windows staged entire performances—note, with rotational, arc-oscillating, and reciprocating motions, the sum of which was described by the German Euler in the early 18th century in six formulas. And I no longer doubt that kinematics developed not so much because of the invention of clocks, but because of the popes' goal of creating a "Ptolemaic" world system centered on Earth, and preferably in the Vatican itself. Clocks were a byproduct of this grandiose undertaking, just as the "peaceful atom" evolved from the atomic bomb. Incidentally, mechanical clocks of that time often displayed not only the time of day and cuckoo performances, but also the movements of the planets.

The most important conclusion, and the one I wish to conclude this work with, is that the "Ptolemaic" world system was created somewhere around 1600, contemporaneous with the chronology of the Catholic Cardinal Scaliger, the "teachings" of all three "Platos", and other falsifications of the Roman popes. I have discussed these matters sufficiently in other works.

May 5, 2002, "late" Orthodox Easter.

I hadn't intended to return to this work, but I came across M.M. Postnikov's three-volume work, "A Critical Study of the Chronology of the Ancient World" (published by Kraaft + Lean, Moscow, 2000), from which I would like to quote a few passages. First, Postnikov cites O. Neuenbauer, "a leading expert on the history of the exact sciences": "There is no better way to verify the internal consistency of ancient and medieval astronomy than to place the Almagest, Al-Battani's Opus Astronomicum, and Copernicus' De Revolutionibus side by side. Chapter by chapter, theorem by theorem, table by table—these works run parallel". This phrase, too intellectual for a foul-mouthed miner like me to grasp its meaning on first reading, can be explained by Postnikov's words: "This elementary calculation yields a shocking result. It

turns out that all the longitudes of the stars indicated in the first Latin edition of the Almagest were observed in the 16th century AD..”. Meanwhile, Ptolemy repeatedly repeats that he conducted all the observations himself and describes his instruments and methods in detail. Therefore, the first sentence (placed side by side) must be understood to mean that it wasn't the Almagest that served as the prior basis for Copernicus' work, but rather that the Almagest was written using Copernicus' work. But I have also proven that without knowledge of horological kinematics, it is impossible to create Ptolemaic celestial mechanics.

Further, Postnikov, having proven the backward calculation of lunar eclipses described by Ptolemy from the very beginning of the new era, writes: "The apocryphal nature of the lunar eclipses of the second century also explains why Ptolemy, while citing lunar eclipses he “personally observed,' never mentioned in any way the incomparably more spectacular solar eclipses, such as the annular solar eclipse of April 21, 125, whose maximum phase in Alexandria was at 10:00 a.m., and that this eclipse occurred only two weeks before the lunar eclipse he described in detail”. What professional astronomer could resist at least mentioning it? Now everything becomes clear: the author of the "Imagest" simply didn't know of a single solar eclipse of that time, and couldn't calculate one, since even in the 15th and 16th centuries, calculating the path of a solar eclipse was an incredibly complex and highly uncertain task (unlike lunar eclipses, the prediction and calculation of which were already being successfully carried out at that time)”. I'll add, either forward or backward, to past centuries.

So, did I write my article in vain? I could have simply cited it. But the point is that the impossibility of the Almagest being written in the second century has now been proven in two independent ways. And both point to the same thing.

Philosophy of Time

Modern science seems increasingly inclined to believe that the flow of time is immaterial, an "apparent" substance, or, as we now call it, virtual. In other words, time as such simply does not exist. The foundation for all this lies in Einstein's theory of relativity, which physicists and mathematicians developed to such seemingly absurd extremes. I, in fact, don't care about all this, just like the rest of the world, which lives by clocks and calendars. But here's what's interesting. Scientists engaged in the so-called "natural"—or, more accurately, descriptive—sciences, as opposed to the "exact" sciences, by virtue of their status as scientists, cannot ignore this achievement of physicists and mathematicians. Otherwise, they would have to ignore all their achievements, right down to the formulas for the circumference of a circle, the volume of a cone, not to mention the principles underlying the electric iron, television, and computer. I say all this to address historians. Given the current state of knowledge, it is, in my opinion, completely immoral not to rethink the chronology of history anew, on a new basis.

After all, even the great Newton strongly doubted it. Morozov convincingly demonstrated that the historical chronology that divided history into two parts (before and after the Common Era) is completely unfounded. He quite reasonably proposed reducing it, roughly speaking, from 8,000 years to two, that is, discarding the fictitious history before the Common Era. And the entire purpose of his research was precisely this, and nothing else. Morozov worked at the beginning of the 20th century, when computers were unavailable, which today make it so easy to calculate various probabilistic and statistical mathematical criteria for the reliability or unreliability of real events converted into digital form. Just like how telephone

conversations, movies, and music are now converted into digital form, making them very "clean", uncluttered, and we all find it very pleasant.

However, Morozov's followers in Russia, armed with sophisticated research equipment, have programmed them not to achieve scientific truth in matters of chronology, like Morozov, but to create their own "interpretations" of history itself. When you read their "interpretations" of history, with rare exceptions, such as the seizure of power by the Romanov dynasty, the Tatar-Mongol yoke, and a few others, you discover utterly obscene things, based on nothing, as if they were created in the ideological department of the CPSU Central Committee or in Lubyanka for complete asses. Such as these have never existed in Rus'. Suffice it to say that they "proved" the conquest and possession by Russians of almost the entire globe, with the exception of Australia and a few Pacific islands. And this despite the fact that Rus' had virtually no iron before "leaning", as Karamzin put it, against the Urals. I examined these supposed conquests in more detail in my book, "The mysterious Russian Soul Against the Background of World Jewish History". There, I devoted particular attention to the deliberate falsification of known historical data, which the authors of this "new chronology" "untied" one chronological scale and attached to another, worse than the one generally accepted today. My point here is that the "Herbalife dealers" have co-opted this fortunate discovery of the scientist Morozov and are churning out nonsense at a frantic pace, thereby undermining faith in the fundamental essence of the problem outlined by Morozov. And I consider this a bad thing. Making money from "Herbalife" is reprehensible, isn't it? Or are they not only making money but also "fulfilling" a "mission" assigned to them by someone?

But let's get down to business. The point is to understand the concept of time, historical time. There's also geological time, which generally smacks of billions of years. It's officially believed that the Earth, as round as it is today, has existed for about five billion years, although there's no rigorous proof of this. In the book I mentioned, I suggested that this is the age of the universe. And that's just the tip of the iceberg. If you look at astronomy, you'll find that time flows not in years, but in light-years, which is the number of kilometers in this unit of time equal to the number of kilometers light travels in a year at a speed of 300,000 kilometers per second (the speed measured on Earth in the 19th century). Let's multiply: 300,000 x 365 days x 24 hours x 60 minutes x 60 seconds, and we get "this squiggle": 9,460,800,000,000 kilometers, or 9.461 x 10 12 . But astronomers use this gigantic unit of time very widely, without embarrassment: Alpha Centauri, for example, is located millions and billions of light years away from us. All this is absolutely unimaginable, and therefore no one cares; it's just a matter of saying it, writing it down, and then "off your back". Even comparing a grain of beach sand to a globe doesn't help. It's still unimaginable. We now find it unimaginable even that the Earth is round; few people see proof of its roundness in the crescent moon in the sky. At least in the past, you could go to the sea, choose a calm day, and watch first the tops of the masts of an approaching ship rise out of the water, and then the ship itself rise from the water, from over the horizon—so it must be round after all. But nowadays you won't even encounter a ship with a mast; they're all like submarines—mastless, emerging from over the horizon all at once.

In this regard, interesting things are happening to American spacecraft approaching the boundaries of our Solar System—a grain of dust in a Galaxy that is itself a grain of dust within countless galaxies. The spacecraft suddenly slow down, even though, according to modern physics, this shouldn't happen. Strange, unimaginable things are happening to these spacecraft, for which there is not only no scientific answer, but not even a plausible hypothesis. And this isn't happening at a distance of millions of light years, but just a few light days. Space is warped, and time is completely abolished.

Therefore, a student at school, completely dependent on everyone, from mom and dad to the teacher, has no time for his own reasoning, although at this age he is quite capable of it, but only wants to avoid making mistakes, to learn, and to answer as his elders are expected to. And so he learns, and answers, and then begins to believe, instead of knowing. But knowing is impossible; there is nowhere to find material for reflection. It's no wonder they begin studying Ancient History in fifth grade, the most dependent age group. They don't yet know what a quadratic equation is, or what sine and cosine are, but they already know that Xerxes or Darius "commanded the sea to be punished with whips", that they began building a tower in Babylon, and lived just as they do today, on their parents' salaries, albeit without a television. The Trojans hold the line, and the Spartans throw small children into the abyss. And all of this happened between three and six thousand years ago. Basically, they're folktales, and that's how they get used to thinking about them. And then, burdened with mathematics, first love, and the worry of finding computer games, they learn to think about the Ancient World "as they were taught", without ever returning to the concept of time, or historical time.

If history in schools had begun not with the Ancient World, not with Egypt and the Roman emperors, but, for example, with the so-called Renaissance, that is, the 16th century, then children would have learned that the Renaissance began not so much with Leonardo da Vinci as with the mass, widespread execution of women across Western Europe. And they would have learned that, before a Gospel had been printed for every church, a so-called "Malleus" was printed for all mayors, consisting entirely of signs by which a woman could be identified as a witch and burned at the stake without mercy. I have described all of this in the book I mentioned. And then, during a period of deepening impressions from algebra, geometry, and trigonometry, they would try to return to the history of the Ancient World, with its unimaginable tales and inconsistencies of events, and they would try to explain how it was that, having created the greatest works of art thousands of years ago, they ended up exterminating women at the height of the Renaissance. What was it that was actually reborn? And then they would try to explain that matriarchy was "on the cusp of the Early and Late Paleolithic", that is, 20,000 years ago. That's the first point.

Secondly, children, learning that just four hundred years before them, practically everything they see around them was invented, with 90 percent of it invented and discovered in just the last hundred years, would involuntarily ask their teachers what humanity had been doing for 6,000 years before that? Note that all known wars, not counting the mythical Trojan War, also occurred during this aforementioned period of time. In my aforementioned book, I analyzed all of humanity's inventions using the Encyclopedia Britannica, and I found it funny. The Indians invented the loom over 4,000 years ago, and the Mesopotamians developed the water wheel around the same time, or even earlier. Persian merchants had been transporting ginger and pepper to Europe all this time, but they never thought of bringing these things, or rather, even the idea, back. In Europe, all of this appeared almost during the Renaissance.

Now it's time to turn to the question of what we remember, and for how long, from history, which we witnessed almost with our own eyes. People, of course, remember their entire history, the story of their lives. The average person remembers 60 years. But who needs this memory? Absolutely no one. For example, most young Americans believe that America fought against Russia in World War II. For our teenagers, Pushkin is a little younger than Homer, and Philip Kirkorov is the founder of the very concept of music. Our children have no idea what communism is, the very thing for which several generations of their immediate ancestors, 70 percent of whom are still alive, "fought".

For the sake of amusement, I'll tell you what I remember from my 65-year life, because they'll burst out laughing and won't even believe it. Well, 80 percent of women in our country at the beginning of my life got by without, excuse me, not only pads of all the familiar varieties and types, but even without panties. In winter and summer, they wore nothing at all under their dresses and undershirts. The standard floor in 70 percent of houses, not counting pre-revolutionary Moscow homes, consisted of clay with a few centimeters of trampled sunflower husks, making the floor like asphalt. It wasn't washed, only swept with a wet broom to keep the dust down. Which made it even stronger. Like concrete. Cows, as we all know, give birth in winter. And for the first few days, calves, piglets, and lambs are kept indoors; they don't ask to go to the toilet, so the aforementioned floor turns from "concrete" to "reinforced concrete”. There was always one bed in the house, for Mom and Dad; everyone else slept on the floor, on the sleeping bench, or on the stove. And all this happened before the Great Patriotic War, during it, and even when I was already studying at technical school, from 1951 to 1955.

Even radios powered by wires strung on poles were only found in wealthy homes, like the elevators in dachas today for the new Russians. When I read in a popular science book in 1948 that you could build an ice rink in the summer (there weren't even a single rink in the USSR yet), I was more surprised than you'd be if you met a Martian in the subway. Ninety-nine percent of Soviet children had never seen a factory-made toy, making do with crafts made from rags or firewood from older siblings or caring parents. Can you imagine a penmanship notebook your mother stitched together from newspaper? And I wrote in one of those with an iron pen, unimaginable to you, resembling a goose feather, and the ink was made from the stove soot in a medicine bottle. When a truck drove down the street—a one-and-a-half-ton truck (with a 1.5-ton payload)—everyone would run out to look at it, just as you wouldn't run to see a space rocket. Almost half of my classmates at technical school saw a train pulled by a steam locomotive for the first time (don't you know what a steam locomotive is?) only when they went off to college. You, watching hundreds of excavators constantly digging the earth in front of your house, don't you know that the gigantic pits for blast furnaces, open-hearth furnaces, and other grandiose structures like the White Sea – Baltic Canal were dug with simple shovels, and that just 50 years ago, the profession of a digger was more common than that of a driver today? Even the metro, everything inside the ring road, including the ring road itself, was also dug with simple shovels, the same ones used today for planting potatoes, sometimes, admittedly, with the use of explosives.

When did some people get color televisions? Not earlier than thirty years ago. Oh, black and white? After the aforementioned war. And do you know how old personal computers are, I mean in our country? No more than ten, not counting the Kremlin, of course.

Why am I telling you this? Because people are heavily dependent on history, which they know nothing about and cannot possibly know. They learn it from others, like the way to the house on Zarechnaya Street. They themselves remember, as I said, their 60 years, and in such a way that they never delve into their memory, analyzing the past years for even the slightest glimpse of civilization's development during their modest span. People simply don't have enough time for that. Moreover, all rulers of the people, without exception, do everything in their power to ensure that people don't have this time. There are distractions for every taste: sex, fashion, circuses, children, family, earning a living, and so on. It is very advantageous for the rulers for the people to live in the present, looking to Hollywood for the past centuries.

Now is the time to talk about whether we know how all this stuff we so widely and carelessly use is made. Let me start by saying that a mason, for example, can lay the wall of a sixteen-story building perfectly

straight, using only a string and a weight as his only measuring tools. A steelmaker, meanwhile, welds a specified grade of steel, using only the capacity of his shovel to control the components, and determines the cooking time by the color of the flame and smoke from the furnace, without looking at any instruments, whose hands are either out of alignment or don't move at all, frozen forever on a single number. Many women are so committed to cleanliness that they're willing to immerse an electric meat grinder, and even a television, in the bathtub and thoroughly scrub it. And yet, almost all of these people completed ten years of compulsory secondary education. There, they completed a full course of study, from physics to computer science. And these "experts" are ready to plug an electric oven, washing machine, iron, samovar, and other gadgets totaling ten to fifteen kilowatts into a single 1,300-watt outlet via a power strip, without the slightest concern that they're trying to burn down not just their apartment but the entire high-rise building. If they do this at home, then at work, their souls demand even more; it's no wonder offices burn down all the time. How many people are there in the world who, after going to school for ten years, learned nothing but wasted time? I think the figure is as high as 70 percent. Although, I need to clarify a few things, otherwise I'll be accused of misanthropy.

There's no one who hasn't been interested in at least one school subject, or even just a part of it, to some degree. This inner feeling is inexplicable, very strong, and its possessor displays extraordinary enthusiasm for its pursuit, but with the rarest of exceptions, it's almost never satisfied at this peak of enthusiasm. Then, unable to find adequate support in the school environment, this enthusiasm fades and evaporates. And this person is lost to society as a future great figure in some narrow specialization. They stop studying altogether in revenge for their unfulfilled interest, and ten years later, we see before us the adult described in the previous paragraph. Thus, 70 percent of social labor for the education of posterity is wasted, while the efficiency of education is 30 percent, maybe even less. And this is a gigantic and completely wasted expenditure of resources, if we consider the principle.

The most interesting thing is that everyone understands this, yet practically nothing has been done for several hundred years to correct this misunderstanding. Why? Firstly, because the state controls it, and no individual parent can oppose this system for their heir. Secondly, the 70 percent who remember school as a terrible punishment see the prospect of the same punishment for their children. So they do their children's homework for them, quarrel with teachers, and generally refer to school in front of their children as a madhouse, which everyone must endure and forget about once and for all upon receiving their high school diploma.

No state can be seriously called a fool, even though it acts foolishly from time to time. Foolish state actions are "justified" by higher interests, higher ideas, although no idea can in principle be higher; it's not measured in centimeters. Although I understand that a higher idea is, for example, the integrity of the state, so that its rulers have more land, population, and money. The brotherhood of man is also a good idea, but inferior to the first, since the state itself sends its citizens to kill people when it deems it necessary. What "higher" ideas and interests does the state have, for the sake of which it sometimes spouts such utter nonsense, visible to the naked eye? I've already mentioned the first; it is declared openly, though shamelessly at its core, for it contradicts the all-encompassing idea: all are born equal and can independently choose their path. Other "higher ideas" are hidden, or rather, not very publicized. For example, the obedience of citizens, or the idea of "all as one”, or the idea of permitted and unpermitted sciences and general mindsets. Or the idea: "Rule Britannia!" How is that essentially different from Hitler's

"Drang nach Osten!"? And "America above all"? I agree that "America is for Americans"—there's no arguing there—but why is it above all else? It's completely incomprehensible.

However, I'll return to the idea of "obedience" among citizens, and their being "all as one", a subset of this idea of "one for all and all for one"—a completely idiotic idea. If you think about it, of course. These are very old, "higher" ideas, and they come from parents in relation to their children. But at least there's an explanation. Parents have given much of their lives to their children. And in old age, they should be confident that their children will obediently embrace their parenting experience, won't quarrel among themselves, and will transfer at least some of their concerns back to their parents, as the proverb goes, "a debt is a debt", for teenagers I"ll translate it as: "a debt is beautiful when paid".

But when applied to the state and its people, these "ideas" have none of the meaning we found in the family. Firstly, the state has never withdrawn anything from itself to its "children", since the state is a virtual reality and cannot produce any real goods. It only takes from the people and divides what it has taken, and not always fairly. I won't fail to note that this thesis is somehow attributed to communists, who take and divide. It's not just communist states that do this, but all of them, without exception. The difference here lies only in the state's conscience: some take everything above the minimum subsistence level, while others leave their fellow citizens more of the fruits of their labor.

Secondly, it's foolish to assume that in a state "everyone is as one" when "every family has its black sheep". And "one for all and all for one" within the confines of a state seems downright idiotic, at least in the relationships between a husband and his wife's lovers.

Of course, statesmen are intelligent people; otherwise, they wouldn't achieve that status, even if they act foolishly. To implant foolish ideas in the minds of the sane masses, one must act not so much cleverly as cunningly. One must simply say one thing and act in the opposite direction. This is called the Jesuit way. So, I finally got to religion.

No one will deny that education began with the advent of religion, and the first schools were religious. Just remember Christ and his disciples, and later the apostles—our teachers. I just described, a few paragraphs above, how difficult it is to make everyone understand the same things. Even the apostles themselves disagreed as soon as Christ was taken to heaven, and even earlier (Judas). And here we have the challenge: to make everyone think alike, when even the apostles failed.

And do you know how many years it took to develop the educational system that we still can't break? Unlike official history, I believe it took only about 400 years. Official history believes it took several thousand years. The details are in my book, the title of which I've already mentioned. Then, statesmen adopted this method of public education from the Church Fathers, without changing a single detail. It's still in effect today, this method. And why statesmen? Because religions, too, were created with the goal of creating a large and uniform state, an empire, so to speak, not under the rule of kings and queens, but under the rule of clergymen like the Pope, the viceroy of Peter himself, considered by them to be the chief disciple of Christ. Although, where have you ever seen a "chief disciple", say, in school number such-and-such?

If you haven't forgotten, in any school, 70 percent of students don't want to study, but just mess around, because they don't find anything consuming there. I'm not repeating this to return to the man who spent several years teaching physics and plugs 10 kilowatts of power into a socket with a capacity of one-tenth of a kilowatt. I'm drawing your attention to this because I want to convince you that there are almost as many

interests, as many beliefs, as many preferences as there are people. It's no wonder it's so hard to find allies; even Christ made a mistake in Judas. I'm not taking into account the stamp collectors' club and the beer lovers' club, which people join not because they share opinions and preferences, but simply to chat. A beer lover might as well join a stamp collectors' club if the beer was cheaper there. After all, people go to a beer lovers' club because the beer is cheaper there, and you can't join without registering.

So, people have different preferences. And in the early stages, there was no religion, only magic. One applied plantain to a sore spot, another snake venom. One believed that if a hunt went badly, his wife was cheating on him, another that the success of the hunt depended directly on the cleanliness of his clothes, and so on and so forth. But since the choice of such magical preferences was limited, they soon began to overlap, leading to the formation of magical unities, and then deities, and not necessarily in human form. Gods took the form of trees, stones, the morning dawn, stars in the sky, and so on. Little kings also appeared by this time, but they commanded a small group of about fifty people, descended from magicians who undertook to perform magical works for a fee, and from this they grew somewhat rich, since everyone needs happiness. But since the kings, who also served as magicians, sometimes failed to ensure a good hunt, a happy marriage, or a cure for the sick, their fellow tribesmen dealt with them mercilessly, using brutal force. They would even eat them in retaliation upon returning from an unsuccessful hunt.

A dilemma arose: on the one hand, being a magician-king was good, on the other, dangerous. Therefore, the kings, who had more power or relatives, divided their powers: they retained control, while appointing a clever man as a magician, who would bear all the punishment for missteps. Life became more enjoyable for the kings. The magicians also lived well, but were significantly more dangerous. Then the magicians, in turn, began to ponder a solution to this same contradiction. But first, it's important to note the difference between the life of a king and a magician. The little king, thanks to the will and cunning of his ancestor, received the royal title, but he himself found himself in a hothouse, a favorable environment, so to speak, in which, according to modern genetic science, negative natural selection occurs. And the further away from their original ancestor, the more foolish the kings become, and they remain on the throne only thanks to the "retinue" invented by their ancestor. Only naturally cunning people become magicians, and their "environment" does not allow them to relax for a moment. Therefore, their children also become magicians, having inherited not only their father's training but also the genetic information that facilitates survival. I omit here the fact that initially magicians and queens were women, and until the 16th century, matriarchy prevailed on Earth within the historical boundaries of warm climates. Details are in my book. Only later, Christian historians, also priests, erased these circumstances from history wherever possible, but traces remain, and I have examined them in detail.

In short, the magicians thought about it, and unlike the tsars, they were no fools. Moreover, to properly fulfill their duties, they had to notice, remember, compare, and analyze everything. This is also evident in modern fortune tellers and magicians. And they couldn't help but develop a concept. First, they could, following the example of the tsars, make themselves the chief magician and blame mistakes in predictions and magical works on their deputies, taking credit for the "bullseye" hits. Second, they had to eliminate the confusion surrounding the numerous magical cults by concentrating them in a single group, that is, expanding their "diocese”. Third, they had to reduce the number of these very magical cults so as not to become confused in their implementation, and thus reduce the differences in people's preferences, that is, by concentrating people on a smaller number of ideas.

All three of these tasks were intimately intertwined, but there were also tasks I haven't mentioned. How long did it take to realize these tasks? I think a thousand years would be more than enough. Consider what I said above about scientific, technological, and cultural progress over the last 50 years, not even 500. I'll just note here (details in the book) that, without exception, all the first gods were female until the very beginning of Christianity, even among the Judeans in ancient times, although this is carefully hidden from today's students in schools.

The third path, of course, was fundamental; it could even be called the path to people's hearts. The Magi didn't yet know that people's preferences are innate and cannot be simply modified by three words like "Workers of the world, unite”. It was then, as if on cue, that various peoples put forward the idea of mother goddesses, who were later completely replaced by father gods. But before that, there were also inanimate gods like thunderstorms, floods, fires, and other cataclysms. Polytheism arose, and the chief guardians of the mysteries of the respective gods began to live quite well, while those further down the chain of command grew increasingly worse. But compared to the common people, it was still better. In some cases, the diocese of a particular guardian of these mysteries, or, as we would call it today, the high priest, grew so large that it began to encompass several small kingdoms, each headed by a kinglet. The kinglets, of course, saw that the fruitful idea of their long-dead founder had produced, as doctors say, a side effect, but they could do nothing about it—they had become lazy along the genetic path and lost their self-confidence. You probably even remember from the Bible that King Herod, compared to the "Pharisees and scribes"—that is, the clergy—was a mere pawn. As the communists say, "the government has changed”. And all this time, there was a struggle for people's souls, to adapt them to a narrower range of preferences, as in schools today. It's no wonder that today every church is so hostile to various magicians, fortune tellers, healers, and so on. As you can see, to this day they have failed to overcome the diversity of people's preferences. And they tried so hard.

The Judeans, a tribe of natural-born traders from Yemen, came to monotheism, as well as to writing, and they had good reason for it. Details in my other works. And one branch of Judaism created Christianity, not for itself, but for the peoples among whom they lived and traded. And then came a period, which has lasted until today, when it was necessary to hammer into people's heads the doctrine of "all as one”. Christianity and Islam have been most successful in this endeavor. And this was not at all a question of religion as such. Religion was merely a tool for creating a modern superpower, or, in earlier times, an empire, since nationality was out of the question; religion had to be the primary unifying force, regardless of the shape of their eyes, the width of their noses, or the curliness of their hair. And these three empires were created. Little is known about the Muslim Empire, although its remnants still stretch over more than half the circumference of the Earth. Much is known about the Roman Catholic Empire, but everything is upside down, shuffled, and convoluted so that the very idea of a Christian empire is almost invisible. The British Empire was loose from the start in terms of Christianizing its "guinea pigs”, and therefore collapsed faster than all others. But the Russian Empire, wrested from the hands of "incompetent" clergy by the tsars, not so much thanks to religion as to genuine, unique, and brutal human slavery, still exists today, albeit in a somewhat abbreviated form.

This unnatural science of making people "all as one" has even outlived the religions themselves. All religions, without exception, have branched into dozens and hundreds of sects, which speaks to people's irresistible attraction to the "self”, to their personal preferences, inexplicable by anything other than genetics. As a result of this religious diversification, religious empires themselves have sunk into oblivion,

although the connection between their fragments remains, and quite tangibly so. Take, for example, the Muslim community of peoples. Internally, they have divided into many sects and states, but they treat their external environment with great mistrust, and against this external environment, they still remain "all as one”.

During the division of religions into sects, "civil" kings also raised their heads, albeit on a new basis, so to speak, political, rather than hereditary. That is, the little kings themselves, having completely degenerated, could do nothing by definition, but they could still be used as "flags"—after all, the people had grown accustomed to them. Clever and wealthy individuals, practically synonymous, began to build states, meaning themselves, not the little kings, used as a piece of colorful cloth with an emblem. These "states”, or rather, the oligarchs who had temporarily agreed upon a deal, also needed more land, population, and money to resist, to prevent the "house" they had built from being handed over to envious oligarchic neighbors. Moreover, the aforementioned rule of "the more, the better" remained unchanged. Therefore, these "states" entirely adopted the rules of "educating workers"—that is, school itself—from the church. That's why it's so lopsided today.

The most astonishing thing is that schools all over the world are, by and large, based on one main principle: "We know what you need to know, in what order, and to what extent”. This applies to Christian, Muslim, and other religious schools, including secular ones. This fact demonstrates that the education of the younger generation is unnatural. This unnaturalness is primarily based on one religion or another, which, in general, does nothing more than make people "all as one”. Moreover, virtually all religions are essentially the same thing—monotheism. And on this foundation lies a sense of self-identification among one's peers that transcends country, nation, and people. This is an artificial construct, pursued by those in power.

Magic and polytheism are more natural and unconstrained; they allow people to make their own choices. Roughly speaking, when you go to steal, you pray to one god, and when you want to protect yourself from theft, you pray to another god. For asking the same god for help in stealing and for protection from theft is both foolish and blasphemous. This is why I spoke above about a person's need to be themselves and develop their own interests, which school neither addresses nor acknowledges. On the contrary, school strives, and not without success, to eradicate this immutable truth from its students' consciousness and replace it with pure ideology, which will become the new "truth”. This is the only reason we spend so much effort and money on education and receive so little in return in true knowledge.

And now I'm no longer surprised that monotheism is considered the greatest philosophical achievement; it's blared on every corner, from every newsstand, from almost every more or less popular book. Meanwhile, monotheism is the ultimate compulsion, which, after much training, becomes a forced second nature. That's why Catholic and Protestant churches now play rock music, and soon they'll have dance floors, and then casinos, liquor stores, and brothels. With the decline of all-encompassing faith, people are making concessions to base desires. Why would this be?

It's strange to hear that the so-called panacea—a universal remedy for all ailments, or the philosopher's stone—a means of making money from river pebbles—is all bad, while calling on the one god for help in theft and protection against theft is good. The one god also becomes a "panacea" for all occasions; one will help everyone. And if a third-grader tells his teacher about this, the teacher won't have anything to say except, "You're blaspheming”. And if a third-grader, smart beyond his years, responds to the teacher's latest idiotic remark by claiming that it's the teacher who's blaspheming, he'll simply be shoved out the door and

told to come with his parents, and his dad will give him a beating. A beating isn't proof for a smart third-grader. But the effect is almost the same: the child stops trusting teachers, tries to hide their thoughts, starts cheating, and loses all desire to learn.

When teaching a child and failing to convince them of something, they say it's always been that way, in the days of their grandparents and great-grandparents, so the antiquity of something is supposedly of great importance, even though antiquity isn't worth a damn. It's enough to remind everyone that humanity doesn't remember anything more than 30-50 years ago; everything else is just school propaganda. And school is forever floating between Scylla and Charybdis, for it will be devoured either from the right or the left. That's why it contains so much idiocy, more appropriately called "tacking". I haven't counted the different types of this tacking. Let's consider at least one of them: the new is always received with distrust. And not by those being taught, but by those who teach. Those being taught are not even told about the new until it's outdated. And they talk about it, the "new", when it's being propped up by the newest. That's why school curricula are such a big mess. Especially since one science has already accepted the new, while parallel sciences still haven't. This is especially true of history. For example, at the very beginning of "our" era, Aristotle laid out the entire philosophy of life at approximately the same level as we understand it today. And Nicholas of Kuzan, fifteen hundred years or so later, writes such utter nonsense that it boggles the mind of any seventh-grader: how can one use arithmetic so illiterately 1,500 years after Aristotle?

It seems I've moved on to what can and should be known, and what one is "not supposed to know". What is true and what is false? Just remember that in Rus", there was a strict "order to burn all Aristotelian books" (Karamzin). Remember the "false sciences" that existed both under Tsar Pea in the form of "false books" and as recently as 50 years ago: cybernetics, genetics, and so on.

It's not that schoolchildren don't understand the artificiality of this division of sciences into "necessary" and "unnecessary", into "primary" and "secondary" sciences, into "bad" and "good" sciences. And the pedagogical method works even worse on them: forcing them through pain and coercion. And not forcing them to run to the store for milk, which is what parents most often do, but forcing them to believe that such-and-such a pharaoh lived 5,000 years ago, while such-and-such a Roman emperor lived only 2,500 years ago. Moreover, facts of this kind are grouped strictly in order on a chronological scale, and God forbid they get confused about who is listed under whom. Who doesn't know that most schoolchildren hate history precisely because they hate its chronology, for memorizing which it is impossible to invent any logical support; you just have to memorize it like a rhyme. And the trouble is that a rhyme is easily remembered because of the rhyme, the plot, and the passion, while a chronology has none of these. It's exactly the same as memorizing a phone book. True, the telephone operators at the information desk remember it almost by heart, but that's their job, which they do for money, and memorization doesn't happen by force, but from very frequent reference to this very book over the course of, say, ten years.

I had a professor at university, an electrical engineer, whose favorite "extra" question was: "Come on, write me the formula for the torque of an asynchronous electric motor". And this formula was four lines long, and even the most economical students couldn't fit it into a single line of their notes. It had to be moved to the next line, at the next plus or minus sign—I can't even remember which. We spent a long time trying to figure out this strange love for a formula that was completely impossible to remember. This professor wasn't even an associate professor, having failed to write a PhD thesis. He had worked for a long time at some design bureau in the most insignificant engineering position, without advancing, and so he transferred to "teach the youth" for a meager assistant's salary—or rather, to mock them while

simultaneously "asserting himself”. In all his previous years at the design bureau, he had never once had the good fortune to feel significant among his colleagues. And the torque formula came in handy. He spent 15 years straight working on this formula. There were no computers back then, although ballpoint pens were already around, these "moments"—and his superiors would constantly ask him: "Look, remove a couple of turns in the stator winding, and see what happens?" The next day, they'd ask him to add one or two turns, you get the idea. In 15 years, our "professor" memorized this formula. He couldn't remember anything else about electrical engineering, and his students could talk any nonsense they wanted during the exam. But he used this formula to catch anyone he didn't like. Naturally, the entire faculty knew this formula, so to speak, inherited from the seniors. And they'd immediately forget it the moment they left the exam room.

I even ranked subjects based on how much the majority of students hated them. First, there's chemistry, which 90 percent of students hate, while 10 percent, on the contrary, love it. There's no middle ground. The problem here is the same as with chronology, which spoils history—chemical formulas, which students are forced to memorize from the first day of chemistry, and only after six months, or even later, they are taught why the formulas look the way they do. And even later, the principles of forming chemical equations. But sometimes it's too late, and the students don't even want to hear about chemistry anymore. Those who love chemistry, however, learned the principles of formal expression in time, not in school, but through their curiosity elsewhere, and they became very interested. Moreover, school chemists often don't know the basics of chemistry themselves, but read from a piece of paper or by rote, like multiplication tables. For the same reason, students hate botany and biology, which, in principle, should not be studied before chemistry. History, too, shouldn't be studied before the Constitution, because the Constitution doesn't follow from history, and history is easier to understand with a knowledge of the Constitution. In my opinion, the constitution should be studied right from the first grade, just temporarily remove all the abstruse words from it, the rest there follows directly from the nature of man, or rather, of a citizen.

And I'm absolutely certain that this idiotic system of science study in schools was created for a reason; it was forcibly imposed, and the rulers don't want to stir this frozen rock; it's more profitable for them. Why? Because the rulers have arrogated to themselves the parental right to teach and punish. This parental right is indisputable; it comes from animals who teach their children not to starve. Moreover, animals first show how to avoid starving, and only punish those who fail to imitate it. The rulers themselves don't know how to avoid starving, as is evident from Ilf and Petrov's example of the "former State Duma member near Proval”. Therefore, they can't show anything by example except theft, and as a result, they force children to "learn chemistry" backwards and punish those who disobey. The most important argument in favor of this "state of affairs" is the fact that the educational and curriculum process in all public schools in the country is akin to military regulations or the infamous Gulag code: "One step to the left, one step to the right is considered escape, shoot without warning”. Just think of how many of the smartest teachers were "shot" or made impossible. And how many "their ideas were implemented" so completely that not a trace remained. So, does this mean someone needs it? Absolutely. And who, besides the state, needs it? Not every parent individually and all together.

Undoubtedly, there are schools, especially recently, where the educational process is natural, embodying the principle: let them figure it out on their own; our job is to help them understand. And no one is forced to force anyone there. But these same schools were previously called just that—special schools, or special schools—like special distribution centers, special hospitals, special sanatoriums, and so on. Now they're

called "high-priced gymnasiums”. But these schools have never taught, and will never teach, ordinary people, even if they're the brightest. They teach the heirs of the ruling elite there, and that says it all.

And one more piece of evidence. You might think that a very expensive school has ten teachers per student, and that's why it's so expensive. Not at all. And if there's a higher ratio of teachers per student, it's because of the tutor who teaches etiquette, who teaches which hand to hold a fork and knife in, the ballroom dancer, or the accomplished rhetorician. Otherwise, everything is just like in a regular school, except that teachers are paid more and can be hired more intelligently. The main thing is that they have a completely different educational approach, one that could be implemented without any extra money in any rural school, but it's not being done. And this proves what I said. It only remains to add that socialist schools, capitalist schools in so-called developed countries, Muslim schools, and Christian schools are twins in their method of "holding and not letting go”, and, most importantly, in their insistence on hammering home indigestible, yet very "necessary" things.

In this regard, I will examine the hypocritical slogan that the minority submits to the majority, which is especially widespread in our country. What nonsense. On the contrary, the whole world knows the truth that the majority submits to the minority, but this truth somehow escapes the consciousness of this majority, while the minority remembers it perfectly well, even if you wake them in the middle of the night. They remember, but they don't remind the "obedient majority" of this, lest they also become "aggressive”. The ruling elite simply molds people in their state schools into an "aggressively obedient majority”. (A term coined by E. Yakovlev that requires no lengthy explanation.)

Now it's time to say that the church supposedly invented literacy, and therefore school. Not at all; literacy was invented by a trading tribe of Jews from the border plateau between Yemen and Saudi Arabia. School was also invented by Jews, for their Talmud states that every Jewish man must be literate. It's just that the hierarchs of Christianity and Islam, which had specifically "emerged" from Judaism for slave peoples, quickly realized that school was the ideal place to brainwash immature but imprinted-as-magnetic-tape minds for a specific purpose: to be good for the church authorities, which had created the Christian and Muslim empires. But the church authorities couldn't maintain control of the empires, either Muslim or Christian. So, the Tower of Babel wasn't built; they simply stopped understanding each other. And they stopped understanding because each of the states that were part of these empires, by the will of their kings, introduced their own literacy, based on the Jewish one, but with their own words.

It was at this stage that so-called secular literacy—that is, state or royal, as you prefer—began to emerge. And with each passing year, literacy spread along precisely this "secular" path, increasingly suppressing ecclesiastical literacy. Until it almost completely suppressed Christians, while Muslims lagged far behind. All sciences are linked to literacy; none can function without it. That's why all schools on Earth are so lopsided, as I've already said.

So, knowledge, and with it, the one-sided cultivation of sentiments, bypassed the church, in the name of the state. Note that political parties didn't yet exist. Then parties arose, and again, based on literacy, in Lenin's style—proclamations—they began to destroy states. Parties also immediately created their own schools, initially in the form of "circles”, reading huts, and so on. It should be noted that parties are always funded by wealthy people, because no party can survive for even a week on its own money. And states became dependent simply on the rich, the very rich, who immediately became ten times richer as soon as their protégé occupied the head of state, in accordance with the "will of the working people”. This is where

elite schools arose, for what fool wouldn't want their offspring to know as much and as best they could about the world, without clouding their minds with mass ideology, which they have no use for. They naturally developed a different ideology, the essence of which is not "man is comrade, friend, and brother to man", but "man is rival to man in everything".

The world became ruled by wealth; money decides everything. And, naturally, schools shouldn't be rebuilt for this; they should remain as they were. They simply divided them into a large school for everyone and a small one for themselves. I won't even dwell on how some exceptionally gifted intellectuals migrate from bad schools to good schools. After all, even those who possess large sums of money often have children who are complete idiots, who are utterly helpless even by the most excellent education. Someone needs to defend their interests intellectually. This is the "working" intelligentsia, which sometimes goes to such lengths trying to please the bosses who pay them, it's enough to make you ache.

I repeat, money has become the most important thing now; everything is subordinate to it. States have ceased to be the fundamental power. And America now rules the world only because that's where almost all the world's money is concentrated. Just imagine. Russia is a great power; I've lost count of how many times it has changed money in my lifetime alone. But America will freely accept its greenback, issued back in 1928, almost a hundred years ago. So even among great powers, not all are equal.

Now's the time to move on to Osama bin Laden. I'll say right away that he's not as rich as the media somehow makes him out to be. And his money wouldn't even be enough to fund Zhirinovsky's party. But he does have a party, a real party, not a terrorist rabble, and he doesn't have the money for it. And, as I've already said, a party couldn't survive even a week on its own dime, as proven by the experience of all parties. And such a party requires at least as much money as, for example, the Russian budget. And rank-and-file members of this party, like our own Chelkash, have nothing but tattered pants. So membership dues like those of the CPSU are out of the question. Incidentally, the CPSU budget wasn't formed from dues at all, but from USSR state funds, from its own factories, plants, editorial offices, and printing houses. In other words, Osama bin Laden needs a lot of money, as much as he needs for a good war. And more than one country has collapsed on military spending, not to mention the war itself. Where does he get the money?

For those who don't understand, I'm right when I said that almost all the world's money is concentrated in America. Incidentally, our own considerable wealth is there too, including Soviet and newly plundered money, which is still flowing there today. Therefore, Osama bin Laden has nowhere else to get money except America. So we need to figure out who in America is giving bin Laden money, and it's not at all difficult to do, as journalists who publish their tales for us tend to believe. In fact, I'm sure those in America who need to know have long known where Osama bin Laden gets his money. It's just that this knowledge, like special schools, is not for us ordinary citizens. And while the American president is dropping stale, rusting bombs on Afghanistan, where it's needed, trade is going on.

Speaking of trade, it has two meanings: the ordinary and the figurative. The ordinary is when they sell a commodity; the figurative is when they bargain, for example, over a country, quotas, "degrees of freedom", privileges, and so on, which aren't directly commodities. It's the figurative commodity, and the figurative trade. As the experience of the two past world wars has shown, it wasn't about the assassination of the Archduke in Kosovo or Hitler's Mein Kampf. Both wars were about money flows, as they say today. About

control over them. But according to the rules of our school, to which I've devoted so much space, our paid historians simply invented the causes of the wars and forced us to memorize them.

Both past world wars could have been prevented, as historians write. But they don't write about the springs and buttons that should have been pressed to prevent these wars. The oligarchs simply couldn't come to an agreement, like the bandits in "The Godfather", or our Russian bandits who shoot each other daily. And it should be noted that the situation is such that reaching an agreement is nearly impossible, as the bandits' demands of each other are diametrically opposed. Either surrender or die in battle. Note also that surrenders are extremely rare; then there wouldn't be daily murders, but simple "patronage" or "roof" in the criminal world, almost friendly. What kind of murders are we talking about?

This near-impossibility of reaching an agreement is fraught with danger. Imagine if John F. Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev hadn't reached an agreement during the Cuban Missile Crisis. We might not even be alive today. And Earth would be home to a civilization of ants that aren't afraid of radiation, and are more efficient than us in every other biological respect. The most interesting thing is that elite people who know how to make money out of thin air often don't pay attention to the little things that, like Lenin's "Spark", ignite such a flame that it makes the devils hot.

The essence of this process can most easily be traced by a single Snickers and Coca-Cola kiosk. Let's say one bandit thought this kiosk was more than half his territory. The other, however, had long ago calculated that his territory covered 51 percent of the kiosk's total area, which was only four square meters. And these two bandits, having a friendly drink in the bathhouse, at one point, just for fun—for their jokes are always just as shallow—argued about the kiosk's size. Note that each of them had exactly three hundred such kiosk units, not counting banks and casinos, but they had been drinking heavily. So they called in their surveyors and the militants' chiefs of staff and instructed them to sort things out, while they went back to their dachas with turrets to sleep. They woke up almost simultaneously, with about ten men killed on each side. Their headquarters, having wasted six months of banditry, wanted to show their service, and they did. Three months later, all the bandit troops were wiped out. The leading bandits, penniless as a result, were immediately imprisoned—one for "possession of a gram of heroin", the other for a Kalashnikov rifle cartridge—and the territory of the two "states" disintegrated and was "annexed" to "Third World countries". Thank God, they didn't have nuclear weapons or bone meal laced with anthrax.

Therefore, the collapse of the World Trade Center towers shouldn't be blamed on the "ideology of international terrorism". It simply doesn't exist. There are the interests of very wealthy people who hire the terrorist leadership. And what is called international terrorism is nothing more than weakness, the inability to adequately resist. In other words, terrorism is the "asymmetric response" that Soviet leaders loved to talk about due to their lack of funds during the decline of a completely ruined country.

This thesis of mine needs to be illustrated, otherwise it won't be understood, or it will be misunderstood. I'll start with Israel, or rather, with Ulster; it's older. It's no wonder the Irish Republican Army immediately surrendered its arms after the skyscrapers collapsed, realizing they'd gone too far. Could this "army" possibly resist the British army and police? So they resorted to an "asymmetrical" response, committing terrorist attacks. The same thing is happening with Israel: it has as much American money and weapons as a fool has tobacco, while Arafat has zero, as they say, without a single weapon. Arafat's boys, quite successfully, but still "asymmetrically", throw stones at Israeli soldiers or blow themselves up with bombs outside Israeli supermarkets. And what about the Kurds, Colonel Gaddafi, and the Eelam Tamils? A page

wouldn't suffice to list the "asymmetrical" responses of impotence. And Kim Jong-il? He knows he has a long life ahead of him, at least with his father's, and the Americans can fire him. Where can he go? So who's paying bin Laden? Or was he seriously wronged when he was sent to fight in Afghanistan for the first time, back in the Soviet era? Still, he can't do anything without money, and he doesn't have much for the kind of war he's waging. He also has children and wives to take care of. Take Chechnya. Its leaders amassed a lot of money, with the help of the Russian government, and decided that their people should be returned to the life they lived in the days of Zhilin and Kostylin, under Lev Tolstoy: pay no one anything, but rob whoever they can. And our rulers, instead of giving them freedom but strengthening the border and expelling all their fellow citizens who don't work in our factories, mills, and collective farms, have started a war. They bombed Chechnya to smithereens and angered the entire Chechen people to the extreme, even those who work in our aforementioned factories. How can we not look for an "asymmetrical" response here? Let them try taking away all Russian taxes from Putin and installing him in the Kremlin as a tour guide to the Tsar Cannon, collecting rubles and living off them. He would have come up with a far more "asymmetrical" response.

Thus, the style of confrontation between the rich on Earth, but not so rich as to single-handedly support the American army, has changed. Chivalrous honor has disappeared. They've returned to the Jesuit style, where the end justifies the means and all methods are good. Rich people should think about this, because even they will find it difficult to completely defend themselves against kamikaze warriors and anthrax. I even think that during the Cuban Missile Crisis, it wasn't Kennedy and Khrushchev who came to an agreement, but rather those forces that valued their own lives, who ordered their purely nominal leaders to stop swearing over a Snickers stand. To do this, we need to rethink the current world order. And here, it seems, there are three deep-rooted problems, although this problem is actually one. These are the "right of nations to self-determination”, the "inviolability of imperial borders" proclaimed after World War II, and "rogue states”.

And in many ways, America is to blame for the current situation. After the collapse of the USSR, she thought she was human, and all other countries were just animals to be sheared and eaten. And she couldn't care less about animal rights. At America's behest, the United Nations effectively ceased to exist, the Security Council barely glimmered, and everyone wanted to join NATO. This completely unleashed the American establishment. And they got what they got. And it's embarrassing to admit that this isn't so much painful as humiliating. And they can do nothing but useless and embittering bombings. An unenviable position, but deserved.

Above, I named three problems, which are one problem. I'll name its cause and then examine it. The cause is the existing school system, which has outlived its usefulness. Humanity has fundamentally stopped developing. Humanity doesn't want to study in school, but at the same time, it happily learns outside of it. Sex, the mention of which makes teachers blush, the cult of power, the cult of lawlessness, drug use, indifference, wild fashion, and so on, against which the school can offer nothing but sanctimony, hypocrisy, and hackneyed propaganda like "let's live in peace”. The present day demands engaged personal development through enjoyable learning, not the shoveling of idiotic knowledge.

And then the question of a nation's right to self-determination immediately arises, right from the third grade, for at this age, a young student still belongs primarily to his parents, and not to the school. And at home, in each of Russia's 200 nations, this is a daily and vital issue—for example, for the Kamchadals, the ban on fishing they have practiced for centuries. Countless such examples could be cited for each nation. A child wants to know at school—after all, the school knows everything—why his family isn't allowed to catch

and dry fish. In this understanding, he sees a still-unclear right to self-determination. Of course, he doesn't get a clear answer. What he gets is pure empty talk, something like this: "We must love Moscow, the capital of our Motherland". Which lies ten thousand miles away, and which he will never see in his life. So, the child thinks, is it forbidden to catch fish?

When, to dozens of such questions, a child receives dozens of equally incomprehensible answers, reinforced by a "school belt" harsher than his father's, he begins to hate and despise the school, the state that gave birth to it, and distant Moscow. But he does this, already taught by the "school belt", quietly and imperceptibly. In his restless childish soul.

Then he grows up, and as soon as war breaks out in his native land, he almost always takes the side of the conquerors against his homeland, no matter who they are. He's forced to think that he'll be better off under any new government. Although this dream may not come true. This is what a nation's right to self-determination means in the most mundane, down-to-earth sense.

To avoid wasting the reader's time, I'll just quickly list examples of "collaboration with the fascists" among small Soviet peoples. The three Baltic peoples, the people of Western Ukraine (Banderites), Kalmyks, Chechens, Ingush, Volga Germans, and a significant portion of Russians (policemen)—in other words, practically all the peoples who found themselves in the war zone. And I have no doubt that if Hitler had attacked from the east, the Kamchadals, Itelmens, Nivkhs, and Chukchi, including the Far Eastern Cossacks, would have been among those "collaborating with the fascists". This, of course, isn't collaboration in the literal sense, but rather what happens to wild, hungry or sick animals. They emerge from the taiga and approach people's homes in hope and fear.

The question of the right of nations to self-determination was immediately suspended after the war with the adoption of the essentially idiotic principle of "inviolability of borders", the idiocy of which has only recently become apparent in all its glory, coupled with another, equally idiotic principle called "it's an internal matter for the state". The moneyed elite who unleashed the war quickly realized that unless they accepted "inviolability of borders" as the basis for international relations, the war would never end, and they would never be able to live out their days in luxury and comfort. But the peoples haven't forgotten that these "inviolable" borders have cut many of them in half—dozens of examples. As a result, half the nation was subjected to one propaganda, while the other half was subjected to the exact opposite. And both halves of the same nation even stopped recognizing each other, like West and East Germans, for example. And I'm not even paying attention to which of them is better off. I'm only pointing out that this is reminiscent of a missing relative, and one that affects almost the entire population at once. Just imagine this national stress in your own individual and personal situation.

Gradually, the principle of the inviolability of the empire's borders became increasingly idiotic in people's minds. After all, this "sacred" border is about as far away from them as Greenland. And before that border, there are still a dozen, if not more, of "their" peoples, who are as "theirs" as Martians. As a result, each ruler of "all countries" found himself at a loss in his soul and mind. The idiocy of this situation triumphed in his people's souls, in sync with the nation as a whole. Meanwhile, an international splinter clung to the "governing" mind, spreading its decay even to the soul.

In other words, the inviolability of external borders, hastily declared after World War II, clashed with the internal worldview of the people, and the people began to act, often against the will of their timid rulers, but sometimes with their concentrated support. Gradually, the "international community", represented by

those same moneyed elites, began to understand that there was no defense against a crowbar, and they became more indifferent to the inevitable. There have even been some advances in the last ten years: Vietnam, Germany have united, Korea and a number of other countries are next. Including Russia and Japan, although Russia's rulers carefully conceal this obvious premise from the Russian people, who, by and large, 95 percent couldn't care less about this idiotic problem of three tiny pieces of land in the ocean. Unless, of course, they're shoving a microphone in their superiors' faces.

Before the moneybags had time to properly resolve the issue of the inviolability of external borders at the international level, an even more dreadful problem—the inviolability of internal borders—emerged on the agenda, delicately called "non-interference in internal affairs". I don't doubt for a second that someone benefits from, or is afraid of, interfering, or not interfering, in "internal affairs", especially those who, due to their thick-headedness and unrestrained use of public funds, can "show Kuzka's mother". After all, in a number of African countries, some have interfered in their "internal affairs", in Afghanistan too, and in the former Yugoslavia, some interference was inevitable. But, as I've noticed, they interfere in those "internal affairs" for which there's no danger of getting adequately—that is, painfully—punched. More blatant cases of "internal affairs", such as Chechnya, go "unnoticed", except, of course, in the international chatterbox. That is, an 18-year-old kid who stole a piece of cable on his birthday will be immediately jailed, but some oligarch who stole half the country and killed fifteen people in passing won't be jailed; there won't be enough "evidence". In any case, "inviolability of borders" and "non-interference in internal affairs" are not only idiotic, but also idiotic in their implementation. And there's no doubt that this is being noticed by both individuals and nations as a whole.

That's why "public education" comes into play to explain the inexplicable—a school, simply put, that lays down the basics, so to speak—and then all this "knowledge" is not forgotten in the media. For those with a poor memory. The inexplicability of the situation regarding "inviolability of borders" and "non-interference in internal affairs" lies in the fact that it is completely illogical, and impossible for anyone of sound mind to understand. Well, how do you explain to an inquisitive schoolchild that bombing Saddam's atomic bomb facilities is interference in Iraq's internal affairs, while bombing Grozny is non-interference in Iraq's internal affairs, plus the inviolability of borders?

And then they tell the schoolchild about Saddam: no, it's not "interference", it's "defending peace", as if Saddam had already dropped his atomic bomb on anyone. But the schoolchild knows that it was precisely these "defenders of peace" who dropped the atomic bomb first, and not just once, by mistake, but twice, with a biased approach. And the schoolchild's eyes widen like a moron, even though he's more sane than the doctrinaires who invented this line about defending peace.

Or take the term "rogue state", which, before the eyes of the entire international community, is bandied about like "pi-d squared divided by four"—that is, it's seemingly beyond doubt, the ultimate truth, so to speak. But this isn't just stupidity; it's a nightmare. After all, according to the Great Encyclopedic Dictionary, an outcast is someone who has emerged from their environment, meaning from the population of the globe, presumably. And there are half a billion such people. So why should they be poisoned like cockroaches? Try to understand this without going crazy, not just as a schoolchild, but as an academician of Russian "literature"? I prefer the term "evil empire"; at least it has historical roots. Just three hundred years ago, our country was referred to on maps as "Tartaria", from the word "tartarus"—hell, where, of course, not angels live, but demons led by the devil. I just want to add to these findings that a country, broadly speaking, is defined as a people within a given territory. Therefore, a "outcast country" has no logical

meaning; otherwise, all human rights, even those of the individual, would have to be abolished, which also cannot be abolished, since humanity has barely achieved this. The word "outcast" should be applied not to a country, but to its leader, the king, and the rulers of that country. What does that have to do with the people? But they don't explain that. An outcast country, and enough of the sentimentality. Is that it?

I hope you understand what I'm getting at, and if not, I'll continue the explanation. Humanity has once again reached a dead end in its development. Previously, it had successfully navigated these impasses, though not without losses. There were many such dead ends, large and small, and I'll focus on a few. Each family and clan, reproducing within itself and warring with everyone else, nearly became extinct. "Cross-pollination" was needed, and it was invented through the totem and the taboo on intra-totem marriages. To prevent petty wars between totem families and the possibility of inter-totem marriages, magic was invented. This magic was inter-totem, for few were skilled in observing, noticing, and using their knowledge. They survived, even expanded their range, but began to war again, this time with greater forces. And they nearly destroyed themselves again, but they invented, so to speak, "branch gods", or rather mother goddesses, just in time, but there's little room for that explanation here. Read my other works, "The mystical Russian Soul Against the Background of World Jewish History" and others.

The mother goddesses quickly established inter-mini-state relations, each in their own branch. But since there were many of them, mother goddesses, inter-state relations were established on various specific issues. But large states did not form. This was hampered by the linguistic difference, which was overcome only through various mysteries-orgies, in which one doesn't need to speak much. Instead, one must dance, castrate oneself, copulate in groups, and so on—that is, perform rituals almost wordlessly. This somehow established relations between the tribes and peoples, who became, in fact, one people. But then a new temptation arose, which I don't call a war, but a temptation, since the more numerous and widely dispersed mini-peoples fought only along the borders, while the interior was relatively peaceful.

This temptation was the construction of the Tower of Babel, that is, the first empire. This, too, was an invention, but its origins must also be demonstrated, since the steam locomotive couldn't be invented until the steam engine was invented. Let me note for now that the construction of the Tower of Babel was pure ambition, characteristic of rich and dexterous people—or, rather, simply dexterous, since wealth is a consequence of dexterity. Basically, out of the extreme hardships of life in the desert, a tribe emerged that set out to trade among other peoples, who, without exception, despised and still despise such things. Having grown rich and prosperous through trade and acquired the necessary dexterity, this tribe, in order to identify itself among all others, invented monotheism. Then this tribe—I'll call them Jews, or Judeans—developed a need for writing, since writing was essentially of no use to anyone else at the time. Everyone got by, as I said, with a few dozen words like "give", "take", "I want", and "good". But this was completely inadequate for trade, and, as they penetrated through the nations, the Jews enriched their language and the languages of other peoples with common words. Soon, direct words became scarce among traders, as they often found themselves at considerable distances from one another. They needed price lists and promissory notes, not to mention product lists and delivery dates. It's no wonder that today, archaeologists find nothing but promissory notes on stones and clay tablets. Gradually, through hieroglyphs and cuneiform, they arrived at the letters: aleph—bull, bet—house, gimmel—camel, and so on, which among their descendants, the "Greeks", became alpha, beta, and gamma. The peoples through whom the Jews traded naturally had no need for literacy; they had no need for it. Therefore, the written language was singular, and the literate peoples of all nations, also Jews, began to build the Tower of Babel, that is, a

unified trading empire. Gradually, when the peoples also desired their own literacy, the construction of this empire ceased; the builders simply "ceased to understand each other”. Everyone had a common alphabet, but each person's words, expressed in that alphabet, were different.

The temptation to build a Tower of Babel persists to this day. They've devised an ideology for it, casuistry, various tricks to homogenize the people, and other tricks I mentioned above, culminating in a school for young people. And the school has remained virtually unchanged since then, and like billiard balls, it's essentially the same for all religions, and now for almost all state institutions. But I've already written about this.

I'd like to conclude with the following. No matter how clever the moneybags are, their minds are always focused on one thing: where and how to get more money? And this is the most frightening thing today. This is precisely why the world could collapse. Simply intelligent people, not smart alecks, should understand this problem, and yes, they do understand it. The problem is that most intelligent people work for the smart alecks, so to speak, on order. And they produce what's ordered. And the world is creeping toward the abyss, where a few oppressed people can do God knows what.

In another work, "Realities and Trends”, I showed that empires are created out of fear of conquest by others. It seems that if you're the strongest, you won't be conquered. The same can be said about excessive wealth. It seems that if you're the richest, your wealth is protected by excessive wealth itself. You can buy everyone, and not only will you have some left over, but even more, since the people you bought will help you do it. So wealth and imperialism grow in the same garden.

I don't intend to teach humanity how to overcome this impasse, and it's beyond my capabilities. But I do have a test for humanity's survivability. This test is education worthy of humanity. "Worthy" does not mean the "rational" kind that flourishes throughout the world today, but rather one worthy of humanity itself, taking into account its genetic predilections and preferences, which I mentioned above.

Of course, its implementation will require a great deal from the moneyed elite, something completely unconscionable. I'm talking about a voluntary renunciation of the deception of the masses, which is precisely how they achieved their "ego”. And now, suddenly, they'll abandon their ever-so-pleasant "I" in the form of such sweet power over people. The first test of maintaining peace among people will be the involvement of scientists in developing a concept for a new school based on a new principle: all the oligarchs' voluntarily donated funds will be given to the scientists anonymously, not as a bribe from a specific "X" to a specific "Y”. And private "investments" in the concept will carry a prison sentence of up to forty years. In the very near future, the concept will be developed like an Easter egg. The second test will be the implementation of this program itself. Moreover, all countries, regardless of their size, wealth, or the number of bombs in their arsenals, will be subject to international control. This is, of course, a utopia, since no one would agree to give up their money or liquidate the empires that sustain them. For this utopia to have any semblance of substance, giving away money and power would have to be the highest honor; no other honor would be imaginable.

I recently recalled an interview of Ilya Kalinnikov, the frontman of the band "Viskosny God”, gave to a Komsomolskaya Pravda correspondent (December 18, 2000). When asked, "Do you have a musical education?" he replied, "Only one of them, and in my opinion, he plays worse than the others. But it can't be helped: a band is a family, and every family, as they say, has its black sheep. And that's because the education imparted in academic institutions is sheer nonsense. If tape recorders had existed in the 16th

century, musical notation would never have existed! It's a very complex and imperfect means of recording and transmitting music. And people with an academic education are simply a nightmare. You can't fix them with an axe. Firstly, they think they can play, and secondly, they can't play at all”.

Brilliant idea. There are only seven notes, and they simply repeat up and down the register. As for timbre, the "color" of a note, the transition from note to note, there's a complete lack of clarity in the notation of sound on paper. It's no wonder composers also write in letters: heartfelt, thoughtful, playful, and so on. And all performers interpret these words based on their own feelings, of which there are as many as there are performers themselves, rather than on the basis of clear and unambiguous knowledge of fulfilling the composer's instructions. That's why we distinguish between performers and musicians, and we bow down to individual performers—a group so large that we even coined a special word for it—globally.

So-called "digital" music recording is a kind of new musical notation, with not seven notes, but tens or even hundreds of thousands. And no composer is capable of remembering them all, let alone representing them in their heads and then on paper. That is, a composer, of course, imagines the music in their head, with all its nuances, but they can't write it down on paper with numbers.

Therefore, when teaching a musician to play, there's nothing better to say than: press the bow lightly against the string, and here – draw it smoothly but confidently, with pressure. Or constantly vary the degree of pressure with the bow – that way you'll express passion. Or sadness-sorrow. But the teacher himself doesn't know the difference between passion and passion-sorrow. In real life, he knows, but he can't convey it in words. Like that dog: he understands everything, but can't express it. This is precisely what Ilya Kalinnikov, it seems to me, is talking about when he talks about the "nightmare of academic music education”. And I fully support him, at least in all other aspects of "academic education”, particularly in history, sociality, and so on.

I'll end with some slogans:

— Just don't copy your teacher, otherwise there will be no development. — The artisan makes a copy, the genius develops art.

— Learned artisans don't give their students the chance to soar; they force them to repeat, and the students degenerate.

— Those who disobey their teachers discover new things.

Realities and Trends

Introduction

This article should be read after my book "The Mystical Russian Soul against the Background of World Jewish History" and previous articles that develop and clarify the book's premises, as I will not prove anything in this article, so as not to obscure the fundamental thread of the argument. This article describes the situation roughly as a gypsy woman divines: what was, what will be, what will soothe the heart. Only the gypsy woman has no previous research, while I do, so I am not guessing, but making a well-founded prediction.

There are currently three systems of social coexistence in the world: European democracy, American democracy, and "cannibalism”. I chose the term "cannibalism" because no known system of government fits the bill. Tyranny, oligarchy, theocracy, partycracy, financiocracy, mafiocracy, teipocracy, gerontocracy—I

even introduced a few obsolete "cracies”. Perhaps someone has coined the term "financiocracy”, but I'm not aware of it. But it does exist, in fact, in various clubs like the Roman one and so on. Mafiocracy first appeared in Sicily, second in America in the last century, and now in Russia. Teipocracy is the rule of one or several clan teips that have come to an agreement with each other, for example, in Chechnya, which can quite easily exercise absolute power over the rest of the people.

But none of the above systems encompasses the third system of government, which I called cannibalism. Cannibalism is a symbiosis of all the above-mentioned systems, with each system's contribution varying over time. And cannibalism is in no way cannibalism, the physical consumption of one's own kind. In Russian, a cannibal is more accurately defined as someone who prevents another person from living, an oppressor par excellence, figuratively destroying others, but not formally feeding on human flesh.

I think you understand my definition of cannibalism. Of course, another word could have been invented for it, with a Latin or Greek root, but why bother? Cannibalism perfectly captures the meaning. Just note that it contains, to varying degrees, all the other components listed above. And remember that these components constantly increase and decrease in magnitude over time, replaced by increases in others. The vessel of cannibalism is constantly filled with them.

I'll need to divide cannibalism into two types, or rather, subtypes, but I'll do that after I've discussed it using Russia as an example. Let me illustrate to make it clearer. Tyranny has always existed in Rus”, but every tyrant never lived to see a natural death. Not Ivan the Terrible, of whom there were four, not Peter the Great, who died long before old age, not Lenin, not Stalin. Oligarchy has always existed in Rus”, since there was simply no one to "remove" tyrants from life. Tyranny would sometimes prevail, and then the heads of the oligarchy, mafiosi, and so on would roll; then the oligarchs and mafiosi would temporarily rein in the would-be tyrant, and he, like Mikhail Romanov, merely feigned supreme power, afraid to stick his head out of the window of his palace. But his son and grandson, through cunning and meanness, restored the lost "frontiers”. Not without the help, of course, of some of those same oligarchs and newly created ones, from the plebs, who were willing to do anything for the sake of primacy among their own kind.

Theocracy has always existed, otherwise our Orthodox Church wouldn't have driven all other faiths out of existence, so successfully, even today. The power of theocracy was demonstrated by "Patriarch" Feodor-Filaret, the father of Mikhail Romanov, who was "forcibly" appointed by Patriarch False Dmitry. Before Peter the Great, the power of theocracy in Rus' was so great that he was forced to abolish the "office" of the patriarch altogether, replacing it with a Synod, which lasted until 1917. The Great Church Troubles of the mid-17th century were in fact not so much a change of faith from Catholicism to Orthodoxy as a struggle for power in Russia.

We've always had a partycracy, not just under Soviet rule, because I consider the nobility to be a like-minded party even more so than the communists. What is a partycracy? It's the party's leadership, which has "privatized" power in the country based on its ideology, and which does not tolerate any other ideology whatsoever. But there is also the ideology of "forever use the services of slaves”, first proclaimed by Judaism, by the Jews. It was according to this ideology and on its foundation that the nobility existed. This is the most horrific ideology, and I wasn't particularly surprised by the last of the Yusupovs mentioned below, who slipped a letter into Putin's hands asking for the return of some of Russia's lost wealth. After all, her ideology is hereditary and genetic. She can no longer overcome it with reason. Please do not confuse our nobility with the nobility of Western Europe. Those nobility owned material property (land, buildings), but

our nobility also owned human souls in their corporeal embodiment. Being a Russian nobleman should be more shameful than being a murderer, for a nobleman could "legally" kill his slaves.

It may seem that we didn't have a financiocracy before today's "oligarchs”, but that's not true either. Demidov secretly minted gold coins from Ural gold, and could easily have produced more than the Tsar's treasury had. Menshikov had the equivalent of a year's Russian budget in Swiss banks, and Yusupov was richer than the Tsar himself. And there's no doubt that, had they gathered together, they couldn't have caused Russia a "default" worse than 1998, or warmed themselves by that fire with all the boundless passion of acquisitiveness.

Rus' itself began with mafiocracy, as Dmitry Donskoy, the mafia leader of the Don Cossack bandits, rebelled against the age-old mafia "right" to pass on an inheritance to an "elder brother”, who might not even be a half-brother. According to mafia "law”, a "brother" is the second-in-command in a gang after the leader. Therefore, the Sicilian mafia is a pathetic replica of the ancient Russian mafia, but how it ultimately brought the island to ruin. Both the Shuiskys and the Romanovs were also mafia, but they were of the Volga region. The mafia squabbles between the Volga and Don mafias resulted in the birth of the Romanov dynasty, the victors in this mafia squabble.

Teipokratia and gerontocracy are separate entities, but I won't discuss them now, as they have no significance in the context of Russia, such a vast empire of 200 peoples. I'll examine them a little further, after dividing cannibalism into two types.

This explosive mixture "in one package" is cannibalism, cannibalistic rule, "cannibalismocracy”. What is it based on? On lawlessness. Tyranny cannot rely on law, since it is itself illegal. Oligarchy cannot rely on law, since becoming an oligarch legally is impossible. And even Bill Gates, the most "legal" of oligarchs, casually breaks laws every now and then, but he has many good lawyers. And he doesn't break fundamental laws, also thanks to good lawyers. The other oligarchs, including the Russians, firstly, became oligarchs through dishonest means, and secondly, having become oligarchs, they began to break laws even more. Theocracy does not recognize secular laws at all, but operates according to its own, specially developed, deceptive laws. For Christ, in fact, like Mohammed, never and nowhere observed elementary human laws, punishing right and left without trial or investigation.

Partycrats always had two laws under one name: one for themselves and one for others. The nobles chose trial by jury for themselves, and a military court for their slaves. The Communists did it more elegantly: they judged differently under the same law, instilling in our consciousness the notion of "telephone justice”. Financracy is no different from oligarchy; perhaps I shouldn't have cited them separately. Although they do have some differences, primarily those of birth. Oligarchs, as a rule, receive their rights by inheritance; financiers, with rare exceptions, earn this status themselves, as the heirs quickly squander their colossal inheritances. As for the mafia, they have their own "concepts" that have nothing to do with laws.

Thus, cannibalism is based on lawlessness, as are its constituent parts, only the lawlessness in cannibalism is so boundless that it boggles the mind. Like the boundlessness of the universe.

Historians say that law and obedience to the law were born in ancient Rome. Now, thanks to my research, I don't believe them. Law and obedience to the law were born where Moses was born—probably in Egypt, which wasn't modern Egypt, but in northern Arabia, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia, or perhaps

even in the deserts of Central Arabia. According to Moses, law and obedience to the law applied only to Jews; for everyone else, it was cannibalism. All others were Amhaar, farmers of the soil, despised people destined to serve as slaves for the Jews. Thus, Jews were the first people on Earth to know the law. Judaism is a religious law, concerned only with identifying Jews among themselves by faith; the private or civil lives of Jews among themselves were absolutely unrelated to the god Yahweh. This is precisely why civil law was created.

The First Law of Moses combined religious and civil laws. Moses, after careful consideration, completely eliminated civil laws from Judaism. From then on, the Jews began to treat their "soup separately and flies separately". Jewish Deuteronomy, which should not be confused with Christian Deuteronomy (the First Law), devoted not a single line to civic life, including blood relations. This is precisely why civil law and civic law-abidingness began to develop independently. The ancient "Greeks", more than half of whom were Jews, continued civil lawmaking separate from Judaism. However, true civil law, still in use today under the name of human rights, was born in Northern Europe thanks to the struggle against the Medici "renaissance", also known as Catholicism. This struggle resulted in Lutheranism, Protestantism, Calvinism, Anglicanism, and ultimately the Enlightenment.

Across the rest of the world, religion and civil law have become so intertwined that they are now inseparable. From this explosive mixture arose cannibalism, which reached its peak in our empire.

In my works, I have primarily examined the Jews' non-resistance to the symbiosis of law and religion for non-Jews. Moreover, their direct participation in the development and establishment of Christianity and Islam, using this symbiosis based on the Moses` Law, is a thing of the past for them. Now I want to emphasize to the reader that this applies only to Christianity and Islam and the countries and peoples where they flourish. But this is far from the entire Earth, and in terms of population, even a smaller part. Cannibalism (have you forgotten that this is a new term, not directly related to literal cannibalism?) flourishes much more widely on Earth, and is primarily associated with empires, which are sometimes quite small in terms of the territory they occupy, not comparable to Russia. Therefore, the Jews themselves cannot be blamed for the creation of a social communal society—cannibalism. They have absolutely nothing to do with it. The Jews never created an empire, and as I will show below, it is precisely the empire that is the cause of cannibalism.

But first, a few words about terminology. It's already ingrained in our minds that "social" means something like "caring" for each member of society, which is where the word "socialism" comes from in today's extremely narrow sense. That's why the word "sociality" isn't in the Russian dictionary, and the spellchecker constantly underlines it. By and large, a social dormitory is a tautology, as educators say. For society is a community of people, a shared residence. I've used the adjective "social" for the noun "dormitory" because the word "dormitory" itself is just as hackneyed, connoting in Russian minds today only a house with a central corridor and rooms on either side, in which anywhere from two to a hundred people live at once, unrelated to each other. The key point here is that no one in this giant anthill called the community is connected to one another by any human relationship, like roasted sunflower seeds in a glass, unlike the seeds of the same sunflower, but in its "cap", resting on a long, thick stalk with leaves. The word "society" refers to the seeds bound together in the sunflower's cap. Sociality is precisely this connection, and it is not limited to mere "caring", as socialists call it. Sociality is a connection as all-encompassing as life itself. That's why I had to use the term "butter on butter", that is, "social dormitory" under the name

"cannibalism”. So that you have no doubt that all the seeds in the sunflower are family, while the seeds in the glass are merely a dormitory, like students or soldiers, for example.

My second point is how should we understand the law and law-abidingness in a civic sense? The very essence of citizenship is that citizens are seeds in a glass, not in a sunflower. But it's desirable to imbue them with some of the properties of sunflower seeds. This is achieved by a law that is equal for all seeds, whether in a glass or a sunflower. This unites the "seeds" in all the glasses of a sack. Religious community is also based on this.

But in the minds of most people, especially Russians, the law is associated only with the criminal code. And considerable effort is expended to achieve this by the rulers of the people. Meanwhile, the law is, first and foremost, the rights of man as such, granted to him by right of his very birth. There is nothing higher than this right. And the criminal code is only a small part of the law on human rights, designed to limit these very human rights for those people, for example, who intend to kill each other. Thus, human rights are primary, and the criminal code is secondary. Therefore, all the "seeds”, in all the cups of the bag, and even in all the bags on Earth, are equal. And this brings them together in an extraordinary way. It is precisely this that brings them together, not the cloth walls of the bag, as might seem at first glance. The walls of the bag don't bring souls together; they only bring bodies together, and in such cases, souls are always outside the bag.

My third remark is about the Jews. None of my work is complete without them. Because I don't like them, but I bow before them. They gave the world almost everything: writing, science, art, the First Law, Deuteronomy, methods of subjugation. And it is they who own and rule the world today. That's why I don't like them. But all this didn't happen because Moses replaced the First Law with Deuteronomy, as one might think, but because these people, for the first time in the history of the Earth, figured out how to trade professionally, and internationally at that, cutting across nations and states like a comb through hair. The consequence of this was the replacement of the First Law with Deuteronomy, by which they live to this day. Meanwhile, Muslims and Christians live by the First Law. Details in my other works. Trade forced them to create not only themselves but also half the world. That is why people now say that they are to blame for everything. But I repeat once again that they are not to blame for the creation of "cannibalism”, although according to the Talmud, they "must forever use slaves”. According to Aristotle, with which I completely agree, a tendency toward slavery is as much a character trait of some people as amorousness. And it is precisely amorousness that often becomes the cause of a "tendency toward slavery”. A person in love is very often a completely voluntary slave.

A slave state and an empire are two different things. Although in some empires, "free" citizens live worse than slaves in a slave state. Empires, as I've already said, come in two forms: those founded, oddly enough, on fear of conquest, and those founded on ideology. The Jews certainly contributed to the ideologically based empires by giving the world Christ. But they didn't directly create empires; they simply enjoyed the fruits of imperialism. Christ, however, created the ideology of imperialism, inspiring the world to transition to the stage of the First Law, which the Jews had already passed through—that is, the unification "in one bottle" of religion and morality, religion and law, separated by Deuteronomy into different "bottles”. Empires were easily created on the basis of the ideology of the First Law (details can be found in other works). The Jews can be blamed for this, but not the Jews of today, but the Jews of old. Ideological empires—Christian empires, Muslim empires—collapsed administratively, but are still alive ideologically. Then the ideologies of imperialism grew by leaps and bounds: communism, fascism, nazism, all of which

contain a fair share of Jewish intellect. But all of this, I repeat, began with Christ. And these ideological empires are, so to speak, later inventions, but that's not where it all began.

It began with people realizing that if you're not strong, the strong will bully you. It began with heroes, physically strong. But they quickly realized that four or six weaklings can certainly overcome any strongman. Then the weaklings realized that cunning, ingenuity, and intelligence are even more powerful than numbers. From then on, clan leaders began to be smarter than stronger. They quickly realized they needed more people on their team, more inventors, more cunning people, who were later called strategists.

And here, to help you understand what's going on, I need to focus on matriarchy and patriarchy. Historians separate these two entities by many thousands of years, although in fact they coexisted even in the early days of the Renaissance, which, as we know, began in the 15th century. What historians don't know is that there was another form of organizing life. In animal husbandry, this is called separate housing of the sexes. Humans had male and female clans that met several times a year by the river to the song and dance of "We sowed and sowed millet..., and we trample the millet, trample it..". In some cases, they were called Amazons. Fathers in such cases had no paternal feelings. Therefore, it was easy for them to steal and sell children from female clans. I'm talking about our forest wilderness, ancient Rus'. And about the northern Germans, Poles, and Finns of the plains—the same thing. Incidentally, the Finns who lived in Rus", from the Oka River all the way to present-day Finland, were called Chud, meaning eccentrics, because they had no knowledge of weapons. That's why they were all later sold into slavery by the "Russians", who don't exist and never did, to Kaffa. But there were also tribes (the fourth variety) that never had patriarchy, matriarchy, or clan-based sexual divisions, but rather good families, like those of penguins or certain species of monkeys, where the father immediately hoists the newborn onto his back and runs with it through the branches, handing it over to the mother only to suckle. These are the northern and Siberian peoples who, without a family, couldn't even continue their lineage. I say all this to move on to empires founded on the fear of conquest.

It goes without saying that to resist conquest, a tribe must be strong. This strength is initially provided by natural conditions—there's plenty of food. This satiety creates a desire to reproduce. But this is purely a matter of chance. A strong tribe produces a strong leader. And he eventually begins to understand that this sudden strength must be used to subjugate weaker tribes, to become even stronger. Strength is transformed into expansion. But then saturation sets in, because with the conquest of ever new territories, strength should increase proportionally. But it doesn't, as the energy expenditure on maintaining obedience begins to exceed the increase in strength gained from conquest. That is, a natural equilibrium is established when it is impossible to conquer more, but it is possible to maintain what has been achieved.

But the mathematical formula for this equilibrium remains unknown to this day, and it's unlikely it will ever be discovered. But even if they do discover it, which king will follow it? For with strength inevitably and automatically comes self-confidence. Such self-confidence, in fact, that no science can cope with it. Moreover, self-confidence conquers science and banishes it far away, lest it irritate self-confidence. For self-confidence is its own science, believing it can survive without science, relying solely on force.

In the most fertile, most populated places on Earth, a balance of force and counterforce, of conquest and retention, is eventually established. Thus arise states that are now called mono-national, although all of them were originally empires. And often, for example, Gascons and Bretons, Venetians and Neapolitans, Pskovians and Ryazanians, Bavarians and Prussians hate each other more than they individually hate the

English or the Turks. Meanwhile, in order, these pairs would be French, Italian, Russian, and German. This is especially noticeable in areas densely populated by ancient tribes, such as the Caucasus or Ethiopia. You'd be hard-pressed to even seat a Mingrelian and a Kakhetian at the same village table, even though they're both supposedly Georgians. A natural balance between states of this type has been established for several centuries, but conflicts still occasionally arise, albeit less and less frequently. And within these pseudo-empire states, conflicts arise. And I note that these conflicts are resolved not by the formula I described above, but naturally, through trial and error. I think I've achieved the concept of diplomacy, and I don't need that at all.

It's a different matter in places where tribes are as sparse as hairs on some heads. Here, if the terrain is relatively favorable, states—empires—of the same type I discussed above are formed, but between these states, it's a half-day ride on horseback across the vast expanse of borders. And in the vast tundra, there are no states at all, if we understand them as small empires. There, everyone lives on their own, like trees in a forest, if the crown represents a tribe.

When such "trees" live close together, as, for example, in the Chechen mountain valleys, a teipocracy results. The most powerful "trees" grow taller than their neighbors, shading them, blocking the sun with their overgrown branches. In the shadow, the crowns of neighboring trees begin to wither.

In scattered family-tribes in the vast tundra, the "trees" don't intersect, and there's enough "sun" for everyone, but another problem arises. An old person in a nomadic life, who must spend most of the day on his feet, building a new house, albeit a simple one, every week, becomes a burden to the family. As long as he walks, he lives, but if he lies down, he won't even survive the move to a new camp – he'll freeze on the way, right on the sled. Therefore, bedridden old people are simply left to die by the fire, while they themselves set off for a new camp, shedding tears. They depart, the fire burns, the old man lies next to it, the fire goes out, the old man dies—such is life. Therefore, in such conditions, there is no gerontocracy.

With teipocracy, gerontocracy simultaneously exists. The elders lie in the warmest corner of the house, and everyone obeys them unquestioningly. They are experienced, far-sighted, and have lost their libido, so nothing distracts them from thoughts of the eternal. A strong teip has a strong council of elders, which dominates other councils at the general council. Everything is very simple if you ignore the details, which, although they shift the balance back and forth, are chaotic forces, their resultant force close to zero.

Let's return to the empire founded on the fear of conquest. As we saw above, equilibrium typically arises between micro-empires, states are formed, and a balance of power prevails among them. But the sword of Damocles—the potential danger of conquest by neighbors—always hangs over the state. But this is a very abstract concept, because the state, if we narrow it down to the people, is not homogeneous. The people and the elite, the rulers—that is what constitutes the state, if we discard the concepts of land and territory. And these two components of the state, or rather, the collective people, react very differently to conquest from outside.

Of course, the common people aren't entirely indifferent to being conquered, but they know that they won't be too badly off; sometimes they might even be better off. I won't give examples; countless others could be cited. The main thing is that the people will pay, roughly speaking, the same taxes, just to different rulers. And, naturally, the people will quickly realize that they weren't conquered to be eaten alive. Any ruler needs the people alive, healthy, and reproducing. The main problem will be the people's pride; it will be severely wounded. But then again, this wounding isn't like hunger, which one can't get used to. People

quickly get used to wounded pride, and assimilation sets in. The cauldron of love will gradually mix everything. Especially if the conquerors and conquered are at roughly the same stage of development, and their noses, eyes, and facial contours are roughly the same.

This thesis of mine will not please any government or national elite, in any country in the world. I'll turn to them now, so that you too can understand why they won't like this thesis, so much so that I'll become the enemy of the entire elite of all countries on our sinful Earth. When conquered from abroad, the elite loses all its exclusive rights and privileges among its own people, knowing in advance that, in fact, it is unworthy of them. And these privileges and rights are very, very great, sometimes so great that if their own people even suspected a small part of them, they would have long ago gathered their strength and conquered their own country. This is both literally and figuratively true. I'll give just one tiny example. All children of ordinary Russians, at 18, play Russian roulette, called the army. In this roulette, as we know, the stakes are life, not to mention the suffering of their parents. And the grandson of not even the current, but the “past” president does not play this roulette, and never will.

The elite understands perfectly well, although there are no fewer fools among them than among the common people, that if they directly and openly tell their people that they must defend their, the elite's, exclusive rights and privileges from external enemies, the people won't be very happy. They might not even be happy at all, but rather become deeply saddened, even angry. Therefore, speaking like that is absolutely impossible. We need to use as many uplifting, inviting, uncontroversial words as possible—simply shamanic ones—but such words are rare. "Motherland”, which is impossible to imagine, "one and indivisible”, which is impossible to understand with a basic understanding of physics. "Sacred duty" amidst absolute atheism. That, it seems, is all. Therefore, words devolve into legalistic expansion: "civic duty”, which translates into imprisonment for the maximum term, and in wartime, execution by firing squad, which is more effective, more radical. But even less understandable than the previous words. For according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, no one can be compelled to kill, even to protect the elite.

I believe I've reached the root of cannibalistic governance. And I'd like to immediately give an example, without delving into the legal aspects of disagreements. Two countries with a combined population of about half a billion people, due to disagreements between them, recently nearly sent the entire five billion-strong population of the Earth to the next world. I gave this example not to illustrate cannibalism, but to illustrate the degree of tension that can arise between the elites of two countries. And it is from this tension that cannibalism must arise when a country lacks strength.

A beggar isn't particularly afraid of being robbed, but a rich person has something to lose, so he's always afraid. The powerless only fear, while the strong provide protection in order to become even stronger. Strength requires money, but money is nowhere to be found except among one's own people. You can "annex" another nation and extract money from two, then three, and so on, up to 200 nations. This is good, but difficult. The more nations there are, the greater the gap between them, the less they get along with each other, constantly wanting to leap further apart. Therefore, less and less power is gained with the "acquisition" of new nations, as most of it begins to be spent on forcing a "commonwealth of nations”.

Here, several variations of the Russian proverb arise: know the edge, and don't fall. That is, you can stop at a certain point in the depletion of popular strength, to varying degrees. The less depleted the nation, the faster it advances in scientific and technological progress, which gives rise to cultural, legal, and other advances. Including progress in the people's ability to earn money. The more depleted the nation, the faster

the opposite happens, and most importantly, money becomes scarcer. But the elite lies, claiming that all the money collected from the people for the defense of the fatherland is spent on it. It spends the bulk of this money on itself. And when the exhausted fatherland can no longer support both the elite and the army, the elite diverts almost all the money to itself, and what remains goes to the army. But at the same time, the tax burden on the people intensifies, as fear and greed begin to compete within the elite. They need to protect their own security and keep their own belly full. Torn between these two desires, the elite begins to strip the people bare. As a result, all progress begins to recede, and the crazed elite gradually, as it becomes "impoverished", introduces elements of cannibalism until it reaches the full extent of its existence.

Strangely enough, with rare exceptions, these processes occur almost in parallel in all neighboring countries, especially in densely populated areas. Parallel and simultaneous. Therefore, the status quo between them is maintained, only this status quo manifests itself with each passing year at a lower scientific and technological level. Soon, these countries will be unable to produce any weapons other than daggers; they must buy everything else. Meanwhile, the arms-producing countries that stopped at the very edge of the abyss I just mentioned and didn't fall overboard have developed progressively, but they've even more progressively raised the prices of their weapons. And states with cannibalistic governments have no choice but to buy them, further oppressing their people. Meanwhile, exporters grow ever richer and move ever faster toward all manner of progress. But since I'll be discussing such countries later, I'll note regarding countries with cannibalistic governments that, oddly enough, this cannibalistic form of government is the unwavering rule on Earth. Progressive countries are the exception to this rule. Otherwise, I wouldn't even be raising this issue.

Enamored with the "new chronology", I won't delve deep into the centuries for proof of this. History can only be read after the beginning of the printing era, from the mid-15th century. Let's take a look at the world from the 15th to the 20th centuries, excluding America, Russia, and the islands where Captain Cook was eaten. The first micro-empires, now considered mono-ethnic states, were created from "small" peoples—tribes. But to this day, these proto-tribes don't like each other very much, despite living in the same country, and often, as in Italy, don't understand each other very well in "Italian". This happened throughout the "civilized" world, from Japan to the Atlantic. The number of wars all these proto-empires-states endured, so to speak, in a neighborly manner, is mind-boggling. But gradually, everything "settled down". I really like this colloquial slang term; it's much broader in meaning than, for example, "calmed down".

You might think that island Japan is monoethnic, but the Ainu—now called "Japanese"—are not really Japanese. And the Irish and Scots aren't English, even though they now live in England. I mentioned some other countries and their constituent peoples above. The same could be said about any other country in the world, but that's not the point. The important thing is how these primary peoples coexist. How strong are the peoples comprising the mini-empire relative to each other? And how ambitious are the dominant elites? Ultimately, one elite rises from the pack and remains perched on this pile, feeding on what's available.

You feel sorry for your own children, less sorry for your nephews and nieces, but your classmates, with rare exceptions, could all die, and you would feel neither hot nor cold. It's the same with "brotherly nations". They begin by taking away the language, culture, beliefs, and customs of the smallest nations, gradually replacing all the ingredients in this folk hodgepodge with, say, potatoes, a favorite of the "main nation". Then they gradually move on to stronger "ingredients" of the hodgepodge, and from the last, most powerful, they retain only, for example, its beloved salt, which, as you understand, can't be in abundance.

This is how we get a "solid, monolithic, and united people", ready to love and defend their "Motherland" to their last breath.

Naturally, they take fewer taxes from their own "children", more from their "nieces and nephews", and they can heap as much on "classmates" as the elite's heart desires. I'm not even talking about the neighboring "school". Of course, there are many nuances here, but the basic principle is precisely this. And this is a universal rule for the entire planet. Any empire that is now called a mono-ethnic state is founded on cannibalism, and this happens because the elite carefully conceals from the people that all people have absolutely equal rights. Although, in fact, the discovery of the thesis "all men are born free and equal" is a greater discovery than the alphabetic alphabet and Einstein's theory of relativity. And discoveries of such magnitude cannot come simultaneously to thousands of minds, as happens, for example, with the notorious wheel, which children invent in their third year, unanimously noting that a round thing is easier to roll than a flat one to pull.

I won't discuss ideologically based empires here; I've covered them in other works. For now, I'll attempt a rough comparison between the Chinese and Russian empires, both created out of fear. The Chinese Empire is incomparably older than the Russian, as evidenced by the Great Wall of China. Many will probably think the Russian Empire didn't have a wall. Others will think the Great Wall was built for defense—historians, by the way, are unanimous in their opinion. Still others will think that China is more backward than Russia today, but in ancient times it was incredibly advanced. It's on these characteristics that I'll base my comparison.

The Chinese Empire is as ethnically diverse as Russia. And the oppression of its peoples is exactly the same. And the infamous wall became great not because of its significance, but because of the Sisyphean labor involved in its construction—that is, the futile labor. And it wasn't built to protect against enemies, but to prevent the enslaved peoples from scattering across the Transbaikal taiga. The Russians had similar walls in the south and east, too, only they were called "zasek" (abates – Tr.), because the people were so exhausted that it was impossible to force them to build a proper stone wall. And the abatis were built for exactly the same purpose as in China. I have detailed this in other works, particularly in an article about kremlins, chets, zaseks, the first Romanovs, and Cossack robbers.

The main difference between the Chinese and Russian empires is that the Chinese elite is generally more intelligent than the Russian one, although not without occasional deviations in one direction or another. The Chinese elite, after all, sees the edge, lest it fall into the abyss. And not only does it see it, but it has taken measures over the centuries, with varying degrees of effectiveness, that, overall, allow it to stay afloat. Many years have passed since they built that useless wall, during which Russia didn't even exist. Then it emerged, grew to insane proportions, grabbed lands as far away as the Pacific Ocean, and just as quickly and ingloriously ends its saga, despite our elite tirelessly shamanises, there's no other way to describe it, a Russian renaissance. There's so much evidence here that I won't even mention it, lest the evidence I omit be offended by the evidence I present.

It remains to be said that, despite all the foresight of the Chinese elite in observing the edge of the abyss in time, which has been going on for centuries, the days of this empire are also numbered, but it will survive a little longer than the Russian Empire. No matter how much the Chinese Empire maneuvers among the rocks, it will not emerge, for the path to the open sea in the narrow strait is blocked by the fundamental law of humanity: all people are free and equal by the primordial right of their very birth. Had Western Europe

not discovered this law and made it its primary focus, cannibalism would have continued forever, returning to the same pattern.

Europe – a tired cradle

I won't dwell on how Europe, without Russia, discovered this law and how, with great difficulty, it implemented it. It's a long discussion, and I've described it all in other works. I'll just say that the Renaissance didn't begin with Cosimo de' Medici, the man historians prattle on about, groaning and sighing about Florentine art and "Neo-Platonism". Cosimo de' Medici began creating a second ideological empire on a global scale (the first was Muslim), and he did so cruelly that he burned nearly all the women at the stake, thus nearly ending human history on Earth. (I've discussed this in detail in my book and articles.) The Renaissance was initiated by Martin Luther, and continued by Protestants, Calvinists, the Anglican Church, and the great enlighteners of the 15th – 17th centuries. And, oddly enough, all of this was supported by the conscientious elite of Western Europe. Why this happened, I don't know, but that it did, is certain.

This process lasted for five hundred years, and it arose nowhere else on Earth except in Western Europe, which speaks to its exceptional nature relative to the general rule of cannibalism. The so-called Roman Empire of the German Nation was an ideological empire, but it was largely phantom. The center of scientific and technological progress simply migrated from the south, primarily Italy, to the north—to present-day Austria and Germany, which, in turn, allowed the secular power of the northern monarchs to become equal to the ecclesiastical power in Italy.

The phantom nature of this imperialism lies in the fact that the idea of Christianity, imported from Byzantium, first took root in Italy under the reigning matriarchy. Then Cosimo de' Medici diverted it toward Christian patriarchy, based on the vast confusion of the Judeo-Jewish patriarchy, and then consolidated this fictitious history of the Roman Empire with the printing press. But it was no longer possible to conceal the growing secular power in Northern Europe, where matriarchy, like in Russia, had never existed. Thus emerged the lopsided Roman Empire of the German Nation—almost entirely phantom, but with elements of actual events. This empire can be ignored.

A genuine attempt to create an empire based on ideology was undertaken by Cosimo de' Medici, as I have already mentioned, but it was reinforced by the money he devised to collect from the growing wealth of Northern Europe through indulgences and Italian banking, which circulated this money at colossal profits. In the struggle between Northern and Southern Europe for minds, Protestantism was born, laying the foundation for human rights. Catholicism gradually retreated to its homeland, then hastened to South America, where classical Catholicism and local religions merged into something unimaginable: the population, after listening to the organ in the church, went home and celebrated weddings, practiced magic, buried people, and so on, according to their ancient customs.

Freedom of labor, which arose from personal freedom, in Western Europe enabled a dramatic leap in scientific and technological progress. This was immediately exploited by the secular rulers of mini-empires, which are now considered mono-national states. I mentioned them a little earlier. And empires began to be built on the fear of conquest, according to the formula: either I conquer my neighbors, or they will conquer me. The main difficulty in this arose because the peoples of these mini-empires were accustomed to considering themselves citizens of a country. Although they didn't particularly like each other while living together in peacetime, when an external enemy confronted them, their shared hatred for the conquerors prevailed over their internal dislike, and the peoples of the country united in a single impulse against the

conqueror. Of course, there were subtleties and nuances here, but the general mood of the citizens was precisely that.

Germany, then France, then someone else alternately gained strength, resulting in Europe getting Bismarck, then Napoleon, and finally Hitler. Insular and peninsular England and Spain turned their gaze to distant lands and continents. Thus arose the British and Latin Empires. The continental empires were short-lived, while the overseas ones crumbled in my lifetime. Both types of empires lived different lives because the overseas empires were built on very different levels of scientific and technological progress between the metropolis and the colonies. Continental empires were created on a roughly equal technical level of armaments, based almost entirely on the genius and determination of the commander.

Now we must consider the question: why did all these great commanders fail in Russia? Historians have come up with so many reasons for this that they're countless, ranging from the winter cold to the famous Russian military spirit. In reality, there's only one reason, and no one has yet identified it. Western historians do so because they don't fully understand the joys of our rulers' enslavement, and our historians because they don't want to talk about it at all. In any war, our rulers lose three, if not five times more men killed, despite the fact that, according to the rules of military science, the defender should lose fewer than the attacker. This is the only reason for our victories; the rest is trivial.

Consider the following fact about wars in Western Europe. Sometimes one side wins, sometimes the other, but the vital infrastructure remains intact. Cities, palaces, factories, houses, roads, bridges, and so on, as a rule, are not destroyed. The weaker side even spares its own soldiers when retreating before a superior force. Surrendering here isn't particularly honorable, but it's also not treason; prisoners are pitied by both sides. All this stems from human rights as such, to which everyone is accustomed and oblivious, just as people don't notice their own breathing. You can't reduce a person to a bestial state, even for the sake of victory over the enemy, and this is natural, just like the need to eat. This is precisely why Western historians fail to understand what Russia gains in war. Not understanding this, they believe in our Russian military spirit, which our rulers sell them.

Meanwhile, all our victories, beginning with those of Minich, Poltava, the defense of Sevastopol under Nicholas I, and the last war, are based on slavery, both of soldiers and civilians. When retreating, our rulers destroy everything and everyone, removing only military equipment before occupying, and showing no concern for the population remaining under occupation. But when they return, they oppress these people for failing to fly away from the occupation like birds. Anyone who has been captured is a traitor; it's no wonder many prisoners don't want to return to their country. Killed heroes aren't buried, leaving them to the crows. War cemeteries are neglected, with an obelisk erected in the main squares of cities for every million fallen. And the true cemeteries—battlefields—become overgrown with grass and bushes, and within a few years, everything vanishes into oblivion. Our rulers, without a shadow of a doubt, can send thousands of soldiers armed with dummy rifles against tanks. And the enemy tanks skid to a halt amid the blood of the people and cannon fodder. Moreover, machine guns are placed behind these unarmed men to shoot at point-blank range at retreating soldiers. So they "throw themselves chest-first into the embrasures”, demonstrating the Russian military spirit to the world.

Can historians of Western Europe possibly understand all this? It's easier to understand the Russian military spirit. I'll just remind them that voluntary suicides are a very small percentage in nature, and roughly the same across the globe, assuming, of course, that they're manifested in comparable conditions.

But I'm not talking about Holy Rus' yet. I'm simply using this comparison to highlight the freedom and value of the individual as such, which in the West have ceased to pay attention to, like the breath of life itself.

There's never too much freedom. It's wrested from those in power in crumbs, but people get used to these crumbs as quickly as, say, an electric iron, a telephone, or a television. Simple necessities of life—food, clothing, a seat in parliament—become available to a nobleman, a millionaire, and a bricklayer. And here a contradiction arises between opportunities and needs, both of which have shifted away from the course established over centuries. The need to eat and somehow cover one's nakedness coincided almost completely with the ability to do so. This was one of the consequences of freedom. And the poorly educated people went a little crazy. The satisfied component of freedom is no longer freedom; it's like manna from heaven. Thus arose the freedom not to burden oneself with labor. One cannot renounce the freedom to work or not to work, for then one begins to starve. Therefore, the freedom to work less immediately shifted toward not burdening oneself with raising children, since raising children occupies a significant place in the work for which one is paid. And, besides, it is itself a great deal of work. Moreover, there are no coercive measures against such freedom of choice; such freedom is even more beneficial to one's own stomach.

A powerful blow, exacerbating this problem, was the discovery and beginning of the settlement of America. Its original population consisted entirely of Western Europeans. Moreover, the quality of the people who migrated to America was, in every respect, the highest, while those who remained in Europe were correspondingly much lower. It's like the law of the sieve. The lazy—though they have children out of laziness about contraception, they are in no hurry to spend their freedom on children. However, a genetic structure has emerged in Europe as a result of which children at 18 take full responsibility for their own subsistence, and parents also do not consider themselves obligated to their children. Unlike Russian parents, who were prepared to feed their children until their death.

The last world war profoundly shook Western Europe. Unlike the Napoleonic Wars, when a comprehensive understanding of freedom had not yet penetrated the average European mind, Hitler's campaign, especially when combined with Japan and Italy, sparked a heightened interest in a broader understanding of freedom than had existed before. People understood that freedom is not unlimited; sometimes it must be curtailed somewhat, with the consent of the majority, not by the dictates of rulers clinging to power forever, or by legitimate monarchs, but by the will of the people. In other words, freedom and unfreedom were weighed on the scales, and all scales were equally balanced. The same can be said not only about war and aggression, but about all aspects of life without exception: economics, property, jurisprudence, religion, and so on.

D. Frazer was greatly surprised that the primitive tribes of America, living in the most favorable natural conditions, were the most backward in development compared to tribes living in harsh environments. I collected examples from Frazer himself, scattered haphazardly in his "Golden Bough”, and from them I deduced an immutable law, which has never failed me since: that it is precisely the overcoming of various difficulties that develops the generalized brain of a tribe or people. I first tested this on the Australian Aborigines, then on the Ainu of the Far East. Then I applied it to trading tribes from the border between Saudi Arabia and Yemen—the future Jews. I received final confirmation from immigrants from the Soviet Union, who taught America to cheat so ruthlessly that to this day it continues to be amazed at how they can cook soup from an axe, sell water instead of gasoline, and fill their banks with "dirty" money, circumventing all known laws.

If this law of mine didn't have, so to speak, retroactive force, then it couldn't operate in the forward direction either, and primitive people would have remained intelligent "by nature" even in ancient, bountiful California. This very "retroactive force", or invariance of the law of environmental influence on the minds of the environment, is at work in Western Europe today. Especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union's military might, with its slave soldiers and countless tanks—a force it greatly feared but, in fact, largely inactive, hoping either for luck or for America. Naturally, I don't mean to apply this law to the intelligence of Western Europeans, but to their carelessness. Having developed laws against fascism and nazism, Europe began to fear only communism. With the decline of communism's potential for power, Europe had nothing left to fear.

This carelessness about its fate first manifested itself in all its glory under Hitler. The might of the German army was certainly great, but it still doesn't explain the fact that in a matter of weeks, almost all of Western Europe was conquered by Hitler. So, complacency. Where does it come from? In freedom of choice? Did the peoples of Western Europe understand that nazism posed little threat to individual well-being? Aren't they Aryans, too? It's the Slavs who aren't Aryans, and that's what they deserve. The main thing is that no force could force millions to die on the battlefield. And their rulers understood this perfectly well.

Perhaps Stalin understood this too when he began churning out tanks by the tens of thousands immediately after the war, while Khrushchev and Brezhnev continued at an accelerating pace. Surely the Soviet Union wasn't planning to conquer America with these tanks? And we had peace and love with the Chinese. I have no doubt that if not for America, which offered us a competition in the atomic race, our tanks would have reached Paris long ago. It's no wonder we held "rehearsals" in Germany, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. There, too, the people didn't resist much, mostly with placards. And if not for the American Pershings with atomic warheads that were urgently delivered to Europe, who knows how things would have ended. In short, the only cradle on the planet that nurtured the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could well have reverted to the cannibalism that flourishes everywhere else on Earth, with the exception of America. And America wouldn't have been entirely comfortable alone with communism unfolding in all its glory in China, Russia, and Europe.

But that's not the main point. The main point is that Western Europeans seem to be indifferent to whether they fall under Hitler or Stalin. This is precisely where I see Central European nations' weariness with the comfortable life. Especially since they allowed communist leaders to find weaknesses in Western European-American cooperation and exploit them to their advantage.

In this regard, I will quote excerpts from an article by Alexander Minkin, published in a Swiss newspaper and later duplicated by the author in our press under the title "Disappointment" in 2001: "The era of love is over. The West has lost all sympathy for Russia. And Russia has lost it for it. Remember how you (from here on, "you" refers to Western readers. - A.M.) loved us ten years ago. And ask yourself: why did you fall in love so much? Was it not because you suddenly freed yourself from the fear instilled by the atomic monster looming over you? As for us, we fell in love with you because we believed you. We believed that you would take us into this happy, free, well-fed life. But instead, you sent us old pasta and old clothes. And they began to teach us: this is good, and this is bad. We raised the Iron Curtain. You tightened the visa regime. <…> We always wanted to be Europe. And we never wanted to be Asia. <…> But Europe never stopped considering us Asian. <…> The West seduced Russia. It played with it for a while, teaching it a little about democracy. Then, when it seemed ugly and dangerous, it abandoned it. Poor Russia, at some point, believed it would be

taken into a rich democratic paradise. But the beautiful West knew from the very beginning that all the places in this paradise were already taken”. End of quote.

I feel sorry for Minkin. He's genuinely crying his eyes out. Therefore, he can't think clearly. I'll help. Minkin undoubtedly has a neighbor in his building, a lazy alcoholic who constantly asks for loans without paying them back, and even steals, not to mention swearing in front of the children. And he has a heavy hand. I won't go on. It's clear without further ado that even if Minkin were an angel, he wouldn't have taken this neighbor "to Europe”, despite the fact that the neighbor wants to "go to Europe”.

I've included this excerpt for a double purpose. First, to show that no one needs us like this, even though we feel sorry for us. Second, to once again confirm Europe's aging, its loss of American vitality. It is precisely American vitality that plays a leading role in the world today, but that's the topic of the next section.

Europe, meanwhile, has embarked on a path of rejuvenation, just as America once did: by accepting immigrants. Europe once gave America much of its best lifeblood, and now it's time to replenish it. Actually, there is a difference. America accepted from Europe not only the viable, but also the educated. Europe now accepts only the viable. But this difference will be erased in ten years, especially since America didn't have a single university back then, while Europe has loads of them. And this is a very good sign, despite the fact that ordinary Europeans are very unhappy with this turn of events. Without the massive influx of assertive and resourceful foreigners from underdeveloped countries, Europeans would have completely turned into callous and indifferent consumers of electricity in all its forms, including for cloning their own kind.

And it would be truly sad to look upon the cradle of democracy and human rights as Egyptian pyramids in the desert, silent, majestic, but of no use to anyone. Like old photographs in a dusty album of a dying old man named Earth. But the most accurate name, in my opinion, that has stuck with Europe is "Old Lady Europe”.

American "imperialism"

This is a favorite cliche of Soviet propagandists, shifting blame from the sick to the healthy. Like when a thief cries, "Stop thief”, or, as another Russian proverb goes, "The thief's cap is on fire”. Yes, American pioneers seized the lands of Native American tribes. Yes, they brought 200,000 slaves from Africa, who today account for almost half of America's full citizens. But all this happened, firstly, at a time when Russia was experiencing the most brutal slavery of its own citizens, not counting the slavery in the "trade exchange" of newly conquered "foreigners”. Moreover, slavery in America ended thanks to the war these same white settlers waged against each other for liberation, something that never happened in Russia. Secondly, I'll ask, what have the United States conquered since its establishment as a nation? They even bought Alaska from us. If they hadn't, they'd be serfs there today. Our propagandists say the United States took part of Mexico's territory, but they forget to mention that almost the entire Mexican population fled to the United States, even if they were building a "Berlin Wall”. But they're not building one. Just as the FRG didn't build the Berlin Wall. And do you know who put the GDR on board with this wall? I think our KGB is the successor to the Third Section, which is the successor to Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich's "investigation and law enforcement" bureau, which erected numerous abatis and defensive lines "against the Tatars”, who have long since vanished. And it was the Chinese who put the idea into our builders' heads with their great wall.

So, imperialism in its canonical sense doesn't exist in America. But our propagandists aren't complete fools either. They "understand" imperialism as "neocolonialism", which isn't colonialism either, since America doesn't have a single colony, and never has. "Neocolonialism", they say, is when a country is lent money, it doesn't repay it, and the "neocolonialists" come to seize the property for the debt. Russia has already had a sailing ship seized for debt twice in its recent history. This is a sacred right, valid not only between states but also between individuals, including in the Soviet Union. Especially if a Soviet citizen is in debt to their own state. So neocolonialism doesn't apply to America. Coming from Russian propagandists, this sounds a lot like a simple insult out of envy, like "You lynch blacks here", a hundred years after the practice was abandoned. Or, "You're a fool", when there's nothing else to say.

So, I want to look at America because, strictly speaking, it's not characterized by either neocolonialism or imperialism. On the contrary, America, unlike Western Europe, is characterized by its selfless assistance to countries and peoples liberating themselves from cannibalism. Although there is still some "self-interest". America simply wants countries and peoples to live as well as it does. It's no wonder there's no emigrant, no matter where they come from, who doesn't dream of settling permanently in America. Even Khrushchev's son begged his way in.

I don't know if Americans understand that cannibalism is a universal scourge on Earth. I guess they do. After all, they come from Western Europe, where human rights were born. It's no wonder there's not a single example of a country that "fell under its influence", whether peacefully or militarily, not improving its living standards. Before looking at specific examples, I'll say that American "self-interest" is noble, but also selfish. They want to defeat cannibalism once and for all, so they can stop spending money on fighting it. And totalitarian countries, which I generally call cannibalistic, see all this with the naked eye, and therefore are deeply angry with America, without really knowing why. And they hurl insults out of spite.

World War II is over, and Europe, while not completely destroyed like Germany and the Soviet Union (the latter destroyed by its own rulers), still lacks a single penny, pound, franc, or lira. America provided the money for reconstruction. Germany is a technologically advanced country, so it used the allocated funds to rebuild everything itself, and then repaid its debts.

As for Italy, in terms of technology, it's the backwater of Western Europe. And that's been the case ever since Catholicism became rampant there. And ever since Western Europe stopped buying indulgences there. Italy wasn't destroyed by war. There were simply a lot of people there, but absolutely no work. And the streets were covered in torn, washed laundry. The Americans, first of all, established a rudimentary democracy there, elections, and so on, but most importantly, they opened branches of all the world's most famous companies, all at the latest technological level. And they immediately employed two-thirds of the population, and one-third went off to build a new Germany on the ruins. Italians are good builders, since ancient times. That's it, within ten years Italy was unrecognizable; the laundry was cleared from the streets, the police were decently dressed, and Italians, like in Europe, began showering daily. Twenty years later, new factories appeared in the most remote villages, hotels with swimming pools, and American-style roads. Europe flocked there for vacation, especially in the north, to warm their winter-hardened bodies in the Italian sun and cloudless skies. Thirty years later, Italian entrepreneurs began to displace the established leaders in almost all areas of industrial production, design, and cinema. Today, Italy is bustling, although Italians are three times less likely to work than Americans. They have ancient genes. In this respect, they are closer to the Gypsies.

The Korean War, in which, essentially, we fought the Americans for influence. Victory was in vain; two Koreas were created, one along the 38th parallel. In "our" Korea, people eat grass, weave and dye cotton using 17th-century technology, but we secretly supplied them with plans for atomic bombs and missiles. And Kim Jong-il is very proud of this, answering the question, why do you eat only grass, “I will bomb you”. But he still comes to us to "be proud”, where Soviet leaders treat him like a pharaoh, forcing their people to practically lick the boots of this scarecrow. And this is done deliberately by our rulers to show this "leader of the nation" that here, too, like at home, people are afraid to say anything unnecessary. In a word, it's cannibalism.

Meanwhile, South Korea has rightfully earned the title of "tiger of Southeast Asia”, despite lacking teeth but mastering advanced mathematics. Samsung, KIA, and other South Korean brands have firmly established themselves not only in the Soviet market but also in Western countries. The most high-tech, world-class manufacturing facilities are thriving here. I'm not even mentioning the meat shortages of their "northern neighbor”. But the most important thing I wanted to point out isn't even that. The main thing is that they jailed their first presidents—the bribe-taking ones they inherited from cannibalism. And the Americans, I think, had nothing to do with this. They had accomplished their mission in this country much earlier. The imprisonment of Korean presidents is the most important consequence of the end of "American imperialism and neocolonialism”.

I'll move on to Vietnam. There, the Americans, having become embroiled in direct war, faced a disappointment even greater than the German regret about Hitlerism and Nazism. America, in a single leap, proved twice as smart, and victory in Vietnam remained "ours”. Not entirely, of course, but by seventy or eighty percent. So what? A quarter of the victorious Vietnamese ended up in our country and engaged in speculation, shipping our electric irons and aluminum pots back home by plane. You can't envy the victors. Especially if you extend this "envy" to the civilized world. Like South Korea.

I needed Hong Kong not so much for its "American imperialism" (it was a British colony, after all) as for its characterization of "communist China" itself, with its same cannibalistic rule. But I won't forget to mention that Hong Kong reached its peak under the very strong influence of America. Today, almost all of China's billion-plus citizens are eager to move to this tiny patch of Chinese land, returned to China after 100 years. What, is that honeyed stuff?

But I forgot about Japan, skipping ahead to the very south. Its history from 1850 until the victory over the Russian fleet at Tsushima is very reminiscent of the history of North Korea. Before 1850, Japan was practically the most backward country in the world. It didn't even have ocean-going ships. Not a single foreigner, with the exception of a small Dutch trading post, could enter the country under penalty of death. The fact that their first ocean-going ship was built by Admiral Putyatin to return home after being shipwrecked off the Japanese coast speaks volumes about their technological backwardness. A carbon copy of the militaristic government of North Korea, Japan, while denying its people everything, built a navy in just over fifty years and utterly defeated the Russian fleet of Admiral Rozhdestvensky. By World War II, it was already a powerful militaristic state, the one that orchestrated Pearl Harbor for the Americans. For which they received the world's first two atomic bombs, on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

When the Americans invaded Japan, they were horrified: a feudal country with a powerful navy—the two were completely incompatible. The technology was completely Western, and outdated at that. Everything was subordinated to one thing—military force. To the Americans' credit, their anger over Pearl

Harbor vanished instantly, leaving only pity and a desire to help Japan rid of its cannibalistic rule. And they began, with fervor, to introduce American democracy into Japanese life. Japan was slow to yield, but the Americans were patient. Their patience was fueled by shame over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the effects of the atomic bombs only growing at the time. As a result, the Japanese mass worldview changed, becoming spitting imagery similar to that of Germany. They even constitutionally abolished the army. Democracy and the market, replacing samurai slavery, did their job. Japan advanced so far, so far that today few remember what a backward country Japan once was.

I should talk about Nicaragua, Africa, Indonesia, and so on, where the Americans have organized life according to their own model, so much so that Russia, by comparison, is now considered a very backward country. I could even talk about an island with a beautiful name, where 200 American special forces carried out a democratic coup, and soon everyone forgot how bad life had been there before. But I won't, lest the transition to what I'm about to say seem abrupt.

For five years, until 1945, Japan and Germany were the Americans' bitterest enemies. As a rule, many decades pass before nations that fought each other begin to forget the war, the grievances inflicted, the many coffins. And if the victors—precicely the victors, not the vanquished—hadn't taken the first step toward reconciliation, everything would have remained as before. These three nations would have disliked each other for a long time. But the open goodwill of the victors toward the vanquished, their sincere assistance, their regret that "it happened this way", did their job. The defeated and humiliated hearts of their former enemies thawed. I'll say more. The French, liberated from Nazism by the Americans and British, are still grumbling, often showing that they are “on their own”. They're still ashamed. About sixty years have passed. But the Americans don't seem to notice.

If I were an American and mentally counted how many countries I've helped to free from cannibalistic rule, and without fail, not counting Vietnam, I'd be rightfully proud. Oddly enough, Americans are less proud of themselves than I would be. I should now describe those elements of American pride and self-confidence that our Soviet propagandists trumpet, exaggerating these feelings to the skies. But I won't do that. Because the paid propagandists have exaggerated all this to such an extent that it will last for years to come. Although, let me remind you of one fact, about chicken legs or "Bush legs”. The newspaper and television "spokesmen" want to present these legs as if the Americans are forcibly poisoning us with chicken legs. They've researched to the point of concluding that the Americans are selling us nothing but chicken legs, injected with growth hormones. That's why they don't eat them themselves, but instead foist them on us. Maybe that's true, most likely it is. But who is forcing us to buy these legs? No one. They're simply very cheap, practically nothing. So we buy them. Note, by the way, that no one else in the world buys these legs, not even Africa. This means we live the worst of all, despite our countless natural resources. It's not wealth that matters, but cannibalistic rule.

I, on the contrary, will focus on the selflessness of the Americans. Their sole self-interest lies in creating peace on Earth by imposing, sometimes even forcibly, their way of life. Is there another way of life in the world that could provide people with living conditions at least as good as those in America? If such a way of life existed, that would be a different matter. Then the Americans should be criticized, and perhaps even fought with arms against the imposition of the American way of life. For 70 years, we were lied to about the communist way of life being superior to the American one. But practice across a significant part of the planet, in a wide variety of conditions, has irrefutably demonstrated that communism is a child's fairy tale,

and impossible to create in reality. So, does this mean there's no alternative to "American imperialism"? So why bother?

And why should they, in turn, spend a colossal portion of their budget, collected from their own people, on rebuilding the world? After all, we're not selling them our oil for next to nothing; we're asking for no less than its current global price. How can one not see American altruism here? Of course, the "spokesmen" will find a pretext here to criticize us, just as they criticize their new missile defense system. As if they need to ask our permission to buy themselves new boots with their own money. Of course, the Americans are rebuilding the world for themselves, so that they can live in the greatest possible security. But at the same time, they're giving all other nations the chance to build their own lives according to the best model available today. Isn't that enough?

We can endlessly ramble on about this topic. Let's instead look at how it all came about historically. I've already said that the Western European proclamation of human rights as the highest law was an accidental, extraordinary event; no one else in the world has grasped this obvious truth. I'd say the same about the American way of life; it, too, is an exceptional phenomenon. Yes, Americans got the idea of the primacy of human rights from Western Europe, brought it with them, so to speak. And not all of them, by any means. Almost half of them considered blacks not people at all, but animals, like horses or mules. I have nothing to say about the Civil War between the North and the South, except perhaps that truth always triumphs over injustice. Or, as Dostoevsky said, "beauty will save the world”. No wonder he's so beloved in America, even more, it seems, than by you and me.

I'll say more about the American Constitution. It's so cleverly written that in over two hundred years, only a few commas have been changed. And in our country, I'm the only one living under the fourth constitution, and with each revision, everything is turned upside down and back again. But that's not all. Our constitution is five times thicker than the American one, but it consists of 70 percent good intentions, like the idea of living in harmony. And there are incantations, for example, about "motherhood and childhood are under the protection of the state”, when there are more homeless children in the country than after the Civil War. And when even the attorney general, let alone one of lower rank, can't even summon an official higher than a minister, let alone summon him for questioning. But I'm still talking about the American Constitution. It reflects, in a surprisingly concise, yet completely and exhaustively complete, everything required for human freedom, the relationship between man and state, the independence of the branches of government, and so on. Our constitution is so thick so that certain things unacceptable for a democracy get lost in the words. For example, amidst the advertising-like praise for the independence of the branches of government, all these branches are, in fact, as if between the lines, subordinate to the supreme authority—specifically, to the budgets of these branches, concentrated in the pocket of the supreme authority. Such examples could go on and on.

The first settlers to the New World were exceptionally strong, mobile, and goal-oriented, leaving today's Americans with a remarkable genetic apparatus. Subsequent immigrants from all over the world shared these same traits. Our lazy fool Yemelya couldn't sail there on his stove. Of all the other countries and peoples, "Yemelis" also failed to make it; they were too lazy. It's no wonder that labor productivity in America today is the highest in the world. But America's intellectual potential is also very high, continually reinforced by intellectual immigration. Suffice it to say that almost all Nobel Prizes are now won by Americans.

The fusion of a strong constitution, a vibrant population, and intellect has made Americans a technologically and financially advanced nation. But recall the descriptions of Americans by European writers of the first half of the 20th century—aesthetes beyond measure. Americans were never depicted in anything other than checkered jackets, matching checkered shirts, and bright parrot-colored ties. And always with their feet up on the table. They were also depicted with a childish spontaneity and relaxed behavior, completely at odds with the sense of "decency" characteristic of established Europeans, who held their forks in their left hands and therefore felt, at the very least, like hereditary marquises and viscounts. And all this with a healthy dose of humor, if you don't know the word sarcasm. And those who have read or will read these descriptions will agree with me. Basically, before World War II, Americans were portrayed as louts with only elementary school education behind them, who made a fortune in gold mines and didn't know how to spend it wisely.

Undoubtedly, Americans sensed all this, and at first they rushed to buy ruins from Europe, transport them to their new homeland, and erect them wherever they could. They named almost all their cities and towns after ancient European names. This was an inferiority complex, and it vanished like smoke after World War II.

Then the Americans looked at themselves—heroes and knights, and at the somewhat pitiful Europeans after the war—and the Europeans looked at the Americans, all with completely different eyes. Americans developed a sense of self-worth and self-sufficiency, which made America as a whole, with what I described above, the country it is today. The Europeans, grateful and a little embarrassed, saw in the feet-upon-the-table figures not the former oafs at a formal French dinner, but free people doing what was good for them and what pleased them.

Self-respect was added to the fusion of constitution, vigor, and intellect, and all of this was fused into noble Corinthian bronze, cast into a bust of an ancient mythical hero concerned with the fate of the Earth. Of course, all this was surrounded by a great deal of chaff, fragments of mold, and all sorts of other detritus and filth from a sculpture workshop, but I'm omitting them so that the core of the narrative remains clear.

Self-respect cannot be separated from the respect of others, otherwise it wouldn't be self-respect, but rather selfishness, egotism, egocentrism, and other "isms”. All these "isms" inevitably result in an elitist concept of self, and from there it's not far to cannibalism. After all, it was the elite that conceived and implemented cannibalism on a global scale. Just remember Great Britain in the days of its glory. Pith helmets, white colonial palaces, and... the aboriginal poverty all around.

Let's ask ourselves, do Americans respect other peoples and countries? But then we must ask another question, otherwise the answer will be incorrect: should we respect bandits and robbers? What about slave owners? What about cannibals? Our ideologists—the "orators"—try to show us that Americans respect no one, which is why they inflate the slightest disagreement within NATO, the G7-G8, and the "Western Alliance" in general. Our people, ignorant of politics and the fundamentals of democracy, believe these "orators" because they've never heard anything else. Who could possibly hear anything from behind the Iron Curtain? That's why our current rulers so desperately want all media to be back in state hands, meaning their own.

And here the question is twofold. First, do Americans respect other nations? Second, how many of them can be respected? The first question requires further clarification. Americans respect those who can and should be respected, and they listen to their opinions. However, it was not without reason that I stated

above that Western Europe is very tired and has decided to look out for itself and hope for the best. So the Americans have to insist, sometimes harshly, that these tired guys stop pretending to be too tired and help as much as they can, something the latter are sometimes simply too lazy to do. That's the whole "conflict" that our "spokesmen" greatly inflate, even turning into a "general crisis of capitalism”. Aka "imperialism" and "neocolonialism”. And today, there's also "globalism”, which our tsars secretly sympathize with. They secretly sympathize with everyone who hates America, for example, North Korea and Saddam Hussein's Iraq.

How many countries can one respect? I'll approach this from afar. If our people, quite tech-savvy, can so easily be convinced of the "cannibalistic intentions of the United States”, then it's even easier to convince young nations, just emerging from the trees, of the same, for example, in Africa. And there have been so many of them there in the last 50 years that cartographers are running out of colors to paint them. And none of them understands why they live so poorly, so much worse than the Americans. Just like our people, actually. That's why they resent the Americans, envy them, and therefore dislike them. And they're all members of the UN. So, even in the UN, not everyone understands what the Americans are trying to achieve with their expansion. And many UN members, just like us, don't even know that the word expansion doesn't necessarily mean bad. There can be good expansion, for example, reaching the edge of the solar system. Our journalists have even coined the noun "expansionists”, which, in their view, is completely unfounded and unnecessary, denoting only bad people.

Under such conditions, one can lose heart, struggling like a fish to the ice for the happiness of humanity, but the Americans haven't shown any sign of it yet. After all, they are a strong nation, as I said.

The Land of the Great Hell – Russia

On the most ancient Western European maps, Eastern Europe and the Trans-Urals are designated as Grande Tartarien, and Muscovite Rus' as Moscow Tartarien. Interestingly, neither the former nor the latter includes Novgorod-Pskov Rus”, which stretched north of the line between Volok Lamsky, Kostroma, Veliky Ustyug, and further to the Urals. Generally speaking, Tartar is hell (Greek: Tartaros, Latin: Tartarus) – "a dark abyss in the depths of the earth, located at the same distance from the surface as the earth is from heaven”. However, some researchers, such as Nosovsky and Fomenko, prefer to equate Tartar with Tatar. This is not entirely true, although in English one of the meanings of the word Tartar can be translated as Tatar, the Tatar language. But it can also mean a capricious child (young tartar) and wine stone (tartar). Furthermore, tar means pitch, liquid resin, to tar; tarry means smeared with resin, and also means to linger and wait. Tart translates as sour, acerb, sharp, and pungent, as well as a sweet pie and even a prostitute. Therefore, "Tatar" here is a completely random comparative name, the root of which is, after all, resin, precisely what is found in the fundamental Greco-Latin word "hell”.

Based on this information, I can confidently translate the inscription on the map as "Great Hell" or "Moscow Hell”. Or "Land of Great Hell" and "Land of Moscow Hell”. It could also be "Great Hellish Country”, or "Moscow Hellish Country”. Since the maps were drawn up in the 16th century, Western Europeans had no doubt what was happening here, on the territory of the future Russia. And it doesn't help that supposedly nothing was known about this earthly space, which is why they called it "hell”. Hell was well known in these parts, otherwise the land would have been simply called Terra Incognito – unknown land. For mapmakers of that time had a rule: if nothing, absolutely nothing, was known about a land or country, they used precisely this term, terra incognito, unknown land, the same as today's blank spot. And to get the

"Russian Empire" (that is, the Russian Empire) to appear on the map instead of Great Tartar, historians on the Kremlin and Winter Palace payroll had to work hard. You've read about this, I hope, in Karamzin, Savitsky, and others.

I, too, have worked hard to debunk traditional Russian history for free and show its true course, also for free. Before I continue, I'll say right away to those who exclaim, "How can you, you degenerate of the Russian people..". – it's better to tell the truth, even about yourself, than to lie shamelessly. I repeat, I won't try to prove anything here; everything has been proven in my other works. I'll simply briefly recount our history as I see it after some reading, reflection, and comparison.

Our history began exactly like that of Western Europe. There were the principalities of Great Novgorod, Pskov, Tver, Smolensk, and Ryazan. Naturally, they fought among themselves to no end, just like in Western Europe. The states of Veliky Novgorod and Pskov, neighboring the Baltic states, also fought with them, but trade proved more profitable. Gradually, Veliky Novgorod peacefully reached the White Sea and the Urals, trading with everyone, including Western Europe via the White Sea. In the Baltic, due to crowded quarters and disagreements, this was less successful. The other principalities mentioned stewed in their own juices, alternately engaging in trade and war with their closest neighbors. Great Novgorod permeated everyone, hence its name. It was called Novgorod because it established its capital in the swamps, in a new location, inaccessible to enemies in the summer.

There was no Moscow, of course, since there was no reason for it to exist here. This region was utterly unsuitable for agriculture, nor for trade. Here, from the Oka River to Novgorod itself, lived the Chud tribes, the future eccentrics, who knew no weapons and engaged in hunting, fishing, and other forestry activities. They had no great princes, and therefore no principality. The upper Volga region was exactly the same—disparate tribes, sometimes squabbling with each other over hunting and fishing. The future Nizhny Novgorod was also founded by Great Novgorodians, who attempted to advance trade along this artery with the lower reaches. Afanasy Nikitin, as is well known, was a Novgorodian. But this trade did not take place among the Novgorodians, and there were reasons for that.

The lower Volga region was occupied by the Khazar Khaganate, founded by Jews at the source of the world's finest table salt and its transit routes to all four directions: eastward, all the way to the Pacific Ocean, directly to Korea. Southward, to Persia and Central Asia. Westward, through the North Caucasus to the Black Sea and then across the Bosphorus to southern Western Europe. Northward, up the Volga to Nizhny Novgorod and along its major tributaries, such as the Oka and Kama. The Khazar Khaganate wasn't exactly a state, as its three constituent populations were alien to one another, like people in a train compartment united by the journey. But while they were on the train, that is, in the Khaganate, they shared common interests, just as they would in a train compartment.

The main population of the Khazar Khaganate was historical; they had lived there since time immemorial. These were the Tatars, the Chuvash, the Kalmyks further down the Volga, and those who still live there today in the North Caucasus. The Black Sea steppes were practically empty. The former nomadic populations there felt threatened by the proximity of the salt route and some migrated to secluded areas, while others became Cossack robbers. Salt, the ancient world's greatest wealth and a major trade commodity, attracted trading tribes here—from Iran and, even earlier, from the southernmost part of Arabia, from the border between Yemen and Saudi Arabia. These were the Jews. More about them can be found in my other works. The Great Silk Road, which historians prattle on about, was in fact a great salt

route from Lakes Elton and Baskunchak. Silk and other exotic goods, such as fur, porcelain, hemp, and lard, are byproducts of the salt trade. I also have research on salt in other works. I called the Great Salt Route to the West and East the "Great Passageway", where renegades from various nations, but not the nations themselves, mingled. This trade was dominated by Jews. The salt was mined by local tribes and slaves, whose services the Jews were entrusted with by their god Yahweh. The salt works and the beginning of the route were guarded by Kalmyks, Tatars, and Chuvash hired by Jews. Bands of bandits from local tribes organized around this salt route, robbing merchants. Some of them were Chechens. Cossack bandits also organized along the Volga, consisting of Tatars and Chuvash, and some from future Russians living near the great river. These Cossack bandits of all bloodlines, often united in ethnic and interethnic gangs, constituted a third of the population of the Khazar Khaganate. The robbers couldn't do without the Jews, since there was no one to sell the loot. The Jews profited from the robbers because they had absolutely no idea of the value of the loot. Furthermore, there was no one else to sell the loot to. And in addition to trade, the Jews had long been engaged in banking, which was then called money-changing. All the money-changers were Jews. This shifting balance of peoples, interests, and defense constituted this Khaganate, over which historians have racked their brains, never achieving any results other than complete obscurity. Details can be found in my other works.

In the upper reaches of the Volga, where Yaroslavl and other Russian cities now stand, naturally, there were no cities; they were absolutely of no use to anyone. The population lived near small rivers, and men and women lived separately, in clans of sorts, based on gender. The leaders of the female clans were old women, now called Baba Yaga. The grown-up sons left, just as male tigers, bears, and so on, now abandon parental care. Daughters remained in the female clan. Men didn't form similar clans; they were too pugnacious and carefree, hanging out in groups based on temporary interests, like today's bandit gangs. Women needed a clan to raise children, but men had no such concern. Since then, most Russian men have been the laziest of lazy men, almost all fools like Yemelya, traveling in a self-propelled stove in search of freebies. The men knew no family joys, and therefore treated children and women much as today one might treat some "nobody's" forest herd. In fact, both the Tatars and the Chuvash lived by the same rule, which is why it was so easy for them to become Cossack robbers.

Now we need to outline the quantitative ratio of men to women in warmer climates and in our cold forests. Details can be found in other works, but without a brief overview of this topic, nothing will be clear in historical perspective. In warmer climates, people lived in very crowded conditions, but the attitude toward women was the same, and women simply couldn't form clans, with the exception of the Amazons, who emerged only in certain conditions, where they could protect themselves. Consequently, a terrible shortage of females developed. Women, left to fend for themselves with children and the meager food supply in such crowded conditions, died out very quickly. Here, I applied Geodakyan's theory, which you can read about in my other works. Based on this theory, I concluded that there was an excess of women in our cold forests.

It should also be noted that our forests had no mineral resources, just as they don't exist here today. Besides, no one really needed them. Everything was made of wood, twigs, birch bark, and clay. There was no need to overtax the brain, as it had to be stimulated by something, primarily family. No family, no brain strain. Gangs of men wandered the taiga, robbing wild bees and fishing, as described in Saltykov-Shchedrin's tale "How One Peasant Fed Two Generals". They caught martens, beavers, otters, and so on. There was plenty of free time, which encouraged laziness. Then came the time for love. First, two clans would

spontaneously meet by the river to the song and dance of "And we sowed and sowed millet..". Then they would go to Baba Yaga and arrange a sexual rendezvous. Basically, read the tales of Baba Yaga, only the ancient ones, not adapted to our modern, shy ears. Having done their business, the peasants disappeared into the taiga.

At that very moment, the interests of the Russian peasants and the Jewish traders from the south, from the lower Volga, coincided. There was practically nothing to sell from Ancient Rus", but the southern merchants brought back very interesting items, primarily sabres made of Iranian and Damascus steel. A cartload of marten pelts was worth the price of one such sabre. But the merchants didn't need so many martens; they paid for all the martens with salt, without which it was simply impossible to survive, even in our forests. It was at that very moment that their interests coincided. Our peasants didn't feel sorry for the women at all, and the merchants weren't sorry for a sabre for a few women. And so trade blossomed. Read Ibn Fadlan and look at the pictures in ancient Russian chronicles that supposedly depict the payment of tribute to the "Tatars". Our men needed plenty of sabers, and women flocked like the Volga River to meet the salt. I forgot to mention that children of both sexes were also needed, since girls were potential wives, and boys—you know what for, as you can see from today's newspapers.

Trade expanded, but it wasn't just a matter of trading randomly on the banks, as originally described by Ibn Fadlan, a Jew who masqueraded as a Persian. It was then that stone cities arose on the Volga, something the Russians had never built before. They housed fairs, the root of which, "yar", I dedicated a special article to in the "Linguistics" series. It should be added that, according to Pavic ("The Khazar Dictionary"), the Khazars had three capitals: a summer capital, a winter capital, and a military capital. Arrange them as you see fit, not forgetting salt, the upper Volga, and the "Tatar-Mongols", with which Russian historians have intimidated the world, explaining our 300-year backwardness and "accustoming Russians to labor", like the historian Savitsky. Of course, there was no "Mongol-Tatar yoke", but everything happened as I just described. And note that the idea of selling one's own people into slavery, including the gaping men who worked in the salt mines, was born precisely then.

This trade would have continued to this day if the demand for salt from Elton and Baskunchak hadn't declined due to the development of the salt industry in Europe. Salt was discovered in Poland and Germany, and people learned to evaporate it from seawater to a more acceptable quality. But most importantly, the demand for female slaves declined, and the once-lost gender balance was restored thanks to the "family—the fundamental unit of society", and most importantly, thanks to matriarchy, which persisted in the Mediterranean until the Renaissance, or rather, until the resourceful Cosimo de' Medici converted it to Catholicism.

In the Khazar Khaganate, work became increasingly scarce, both for Jews, bandits, and for the Persians who came there, who were also mostly Jewish traders. The indigenous peoples who lived there didn't care. They still live there today, albeit a little shabbily. Itil, also known as Astrakhan, became as useless as the now-forgotten Kaluga, Kostroma, Yaroslavl, or Vologda. Some of the bandits retreated to the Yaik River, renamed the Ural by Catherine II for Pugachev, and took up relatively honest labor. Others migrated to the upper Volga, where it was impossible to distinguish between the Chuvash, Russians, and Tatars; they had become entwined in bandit battles, including among themselves. But trade also dwindled, as slaves were no longer needed, leaving only timber for export and salt for import. And a few other small items, like honey, wax, and the notorious hemp. The bandits became more or less sedentary and switched to exploiting the sedentary Volga tribes. Considering that Jews invented vodka, and some of them, having intermarried with

bandits, arrived with them, the "privatization" of the common people began in the form of "bonded serfdom”, "purchases”, "peasant exports”, "elderly”, "silver coins”, "reserved years”, and so on. (Read the Great Soviet Encyclopedia.) But note that all this was done for vodka, because the encyclopedia doesn't mention it, but I have it in the book I mentioned.

The most far-sighted and intelligent Jews from the Khazar Khaganate headed to the Don, building the city of Sarkel there, which the communists deliberately flooded with the useless Tsimlyansk "sea" so that we wouldn't learn from archaeologists what really stood there. The Romanovs burned all the papers. But more on that later. These were the days of galleys—rowed seagoing vessels that required a large number of rowers, as the oars were arranged in two or even three rows on each side. Don Cossack bandits, some from the Volga, others from the south, north, and Dnieper, began supplying slaves from beyond the Oka, hunting down unarmed Chud—or, in short, "eccentrics"—in the forests. The Jews sold them in Kafa, now Feodosia. They also dealt in salt, shipping it from the Volga along the Don to the mouth of the Seversky Donets, and then along the Samara River to the Dnieper, and beyond. Ilya Muromets commanded the bandits. But gradually, the bandit leaders, who had grown rich, grew tired of living in huts on the Don and moved closer to their fishing grounds, to the Oka, where they built Kolomna. From here, they sent the "eccentrics" they'd caught down the Don, naturally escorting them on foot to the Don. And the Crimean Tatars had nothing to do with it; it was all made up, and they didn't object; after all, it was prestigious to be considered such strongmen. Although, in Crimea itself, they helped Jews transport their "goods”, for a fee. (I describe this in detail in my book.)

The bandit leaders liked the settled life, and this is evident in the current leaders. They live in Switzerland, somewhere near Lake Geneva, while their "production" is in Russia. Their local deputies initially obeyed and "respected" their "authorities”, but then they began to think better of it. They became frustrated: with all the work and danger, there was no time to drink properly, and the loot had to be sent to Switzerland—and in cash equivalents, forgive me, not to Switzerland, of course, but to Kolomna. Conflicts were brewing between the "local leadership" and the "bosses" in Kolomna, so the "bosses" moved further away, founding the city of Moscow, a completely wooden one that burned down every week, due to drunkenness, of course. There was one consolation: when the "boss" in Moscow died, an heir was summoned from the Don—the deceased's younger brother. And it wasn't necessarily a blood brother, a "brother”. Even today, he's not necessarily a brother; they're all just "brothers”. Simply a substitute. And historians are puzzled over how and why Russians inherited from elder to younger brother? After all, no one else did it that way, except us.

Everything went on like that until the "boss" Dmitry Donskoy, who lived in Moscow and was therefore so named because he was the "boss" of the Don, decided that he would no longer call upon an heir from the Don, but would install his own grown son in his place. That's when his outraged potential successor from the Don arrived in Moscow at the head of the entire Don horde to "assert his rights”, as they say today. This was the "Battle of Kulikovo" in Moscow at Kulishki. (Read the works of the new chronologists Nosovsky and Fomenko.) But Donskoy defeated his brothers, and the succession was transferred from father to son. And that's precisely why, for a hundred years, the Don Cossacks "on the ground" tried, with varying success, to restore justice. But that's not the point. The point is that one couldn't carry on their essentially inseparable "business" without the other. A "division of labor" arose: Muscovites caught and drove the "goods" to the Oka River in Kolomna, while the Don Cossacks received the "goods" and shipped them onward.

Intermediate settlements took place in Kolomna. But relations, of course, were strained. Later, the Don Cossacks were "identified" with the Crimean Tatars.

Upper Volga bandits, like the Shuiskys and Romanovs, lived in the cities of Vladimir, Suzdal, and so on, built by Jews—not with their own hands, of course, but with their own brains. And then came word that such a splendid trade had been established in backwater Moscow, a "business" with virtually no overhead. It was from this very moment that the history of the Romanovs, all the False Dmitrys, Patriarch Philaret the "Polish", and other such turmoil began. (Read my article "About Kremlins, Cheti, Zaseki, the First Romanovs, and the Cossack Robbers").

In short, the Romanovs defeated the "Don Cossacks", or "Rurikovichs", as they are completely incorrectly called. But then the demand for slaves fell to zero. English Jews from Byzantium invented ingenious fixed sails. Jews always sought to increase labor productivity, as managing a large number of slaves is difficult. Peter's father, Alexei Mikhailovich, invented a new faith, now called Orthodoxy, the superficial difference being merely three fingers baptized instead of the Catholic two. The real difference, however, was the brutal exploitation of the people, sanctioned by this new faith. But the resourceful Alexei Mikhailovich reinforced this belief with his famous Cathedral Code of 1649, which lasted, further strengthened by Catherine II, until 1861. That is, the sale of one's people "to the outside" was "forced" to be replaced by internal slavery.

All of this is so ingrained in our genes that even today we obey unquestioningly any fool on the throne, any "master"—whether in the housing office, the police, at work, in court, or anywhere else.

"Greeks" and "Persians"

All human civilization owes its origins to the "trading tribes" from the border of Yemen and Saudi Arabia, that is, to the Jews, and I will never tire of repeating this. I have devoted many works to this subject, beginning with the book "The Mysterious Russian Soul Against the Background of World Jewish History". You can also read "The Trade Secret of the Arabian Peninsula" or the series of articles "The Lost Link of the History". Therefore, I will not examine in detail the development of science, beginning with the invention of expanded human speech and written language. Nor will I examine in detail the two Jewish tribes: eastern and western, instead of the 12 or 13 recorded in history. I've discussed this in sufficient detail in my "Renan and Koestler" series, particularly in "Two Sides of the Coin".

Here I'll examine the relationship and rivalry between the Western and Eastern "tribes of Israel", which continues to this day. The Eastern tribe devoted all its powerful intellectual abilities to infiltrating the local elites, filtering them through the aborigines. This was the easiest path to prosperity, as it accorded with the aspirations of the petty aborigine kings to rule over their common people for their own benefit. It was simply necessary to provide an ideological foundation and theoretically justify this power, supposedly emanating from God. To achieve this, the Jews brought to light the Moses` Law, a mishmash of liturgy and morality, which they themselves had long ago abandoned due to the obvious nonsense of such a mixture of unmixed elements. They themselves had long lived by Deuteronomy, which contained only liturgy and nothing else. They relegated morality to the "era of the judges". But the First Law was particularly well suited to intoxicating the masses; after all, they themselves initially thought it would be a blessing, since it was easily understood by all who were not so far-sighted. Thus, both Christ and Muhammad were born in Jewish minds, only Muhammad somewhat earlier, contrary to official history. Moreover, they both

corresponded to the ancient Persian god Mithra, whose surname was Justice. For everyone would like to see Justice as a god; it's only natural.

I won't go into how hypocritical and utopian the First Law, which, through great foolishness, is now considered Deuteronomy in Islam and Christianity, is; I've devoted most of my previous works to this topic. I will only say that almost all modern religions are based on it, and they are nothing more than the ideological subjugation of the masses by the elite. In their first step, having given the local kings this ideological weapon and having penetrated the very heart of the indigenous elite, the Jews of the Eastern tribe began to live happily, gradually forgetting even that they were Jews. (See articles under the general headings "Before Jesus", "Jesus", and "After Jesus"). They were Persians, the Chamenid dynasty, perhaps even Canaanite, because the graphoanalysts of antiquity have become completely confused by letters and sounds.

Once a reliable national ideology had been created, and touching it was as explosive as a Chechen "tripwire", the hard-working Jewish mind directed all its efforts toward the exact sciences: mathematics, astronomy, not forgetting the arts, especially poetics. And here the "Persians" achieved unprecedented heights, which still amaze us. While the Jews, disguised as Persians, were busy with this, intra-elite squabbles prevailed and divided monolithic Islam into Nestorianism, from which Christianity ultimately emerged, and Islam proper. And these squabbles took place specifically in Persia, as they didn't affect either Africa or Indonesia. In fact, Nestorianism didn't even flare up in Persia itself, but somewhere closer to its outskirts, for example, in Central Asia, whose ruler, also not without the influence of Jewish "viziers", decided to no longer submit to central authority. Just like Rossel with his defunct Ural Republic, or Lebed with his "Krasnoyarsk" army. But I described the division of Islam into two religions in my article "Judaism, Orthodox Faith, Orthodoxy, and Catholicism "in One Bottle,'" so I won't repeat myself. The main thing is that the entire East found itself under the power of practically the same ideology, for its two branches, if we discard the details and leave only the essence of the subordination of the majority to the minority, differ to this day no more than the three-fingered sign of the Orthodox from the two-fingered sign of the Catholics.

I turn to the Jews who founded one of the world's customs posts, on the Bosphorus, called Byzantium (not to be confused with Byzantium, which never existed), Constantinople, and so on. This is the western tribe of Israel, and it arrived via Ethiopia and Egypt, having visited the entire southern coast of the Mediterranean. Just as the Eastern Jews became "Persians", so the Western Jews became "Greeks". But there is one peculiarity here, one that is today turning the world for the better. However, it remains to be seen whether this will succeed. That is why I am writing this article.

The fact is that Western Jews did not abandon the true Deuteronomy, that is, one that contained only liturgy and discarded morality, giving it over to an independent movement—jurisprudence. And this was a great blessing for humanity. Both these movements began to develop independently, especially the second, which ultimately resulted in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. (Details in the aforementioned book).

The Jews did not interfere with the natives (non-Greeks) practicing their feminine religions, with mother goddesses at their head, for the Europeans had a matriarchy, forcibly replaced by patriarchy only under Cosimo de' Medici. The Greeks, however, were not all Jews; Jews constituted only the elite of the Greek trading society, exercising supreme control over trade policy and banking, while the local tribes constituted the middle and lower echelons of this system, and they were not Jews. The Jews did not allow them into their religion, yet these "ordinary Greeks" carried out the trade itself, that is, the shipping of goods across

the seas, from Trebizond on the Black Sea to Gibraltar on the Mediterranean. Therefore, this mass was highly susceptible to outside influences, being almost perpetually on the move. Polytheism, especially with a feminine principle, isn't a very strong religion, especially for sailors, for it's based more on carnal love than reason. Therefore, Christianity, in the form of Nestorianism or Orthodox Faith, penetrated this environment primarily through the Black Sea Caucasus.

This is where we can turn to the Greco-Persian Wars, which, of course, never happened. Islam didn't penetrate this environment because it had to be cultivated from above, by rulers. But the rulers in the Mediterranean were Jews, albeit unofficially, and introducing Islam to them made no sense. Everything worked well in trade without Islam. And Nestorianism—Christianity—Orthodox Faith penetrated because it had only just begun to break away from Islam and was not a state religion. Perhaps only somewhere in Central Asia, which considered itself "Rossels and Swans". Or, more generally, a "Siberian Republic". It permeated the landscape in much the same way the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is permeating the former Soviet republics today. Recently, I went to every bookstore in Moscow—March 14, 2002, to be exact—and couldn't find this very same Delaration in a single one, and the salespeople stared at me and spun nonsense about how they'd "snatched it up". Meanwhile, the shelves were groaning with "Marinins" and other "writers".

When the trade in slaves, salt, and timber through the Bosphorus declined, most Jews, in the guise of Greeks, were already prepared and headed to Western Europe to do what they had been doing since the beginning of time. But I've forgotten about the Greco-Persian Wars again. Of course, there were raiding expeditions on both sides, for where there's trade, there are bandits. But they've been greatly exaggerated, and that shouldn't be overlooked. Because I've proven in other works that, with equal weaponry, it's impossible not only to keep conquered peoples subservient, even for a week, but even to conquer them at all. For in those days, there weren't even enough sabers and pikes to equip even one modern regiment. All this is fantasy, like the tale of Yeruslan Lazarevich, with his severed head the size of a house in a field, or Xerxes with his thousands of ships. Just look at the first hours after the tragedy in New York, when the casualties numbered in the tens of thousands—I think around forty, but it turned out to be just over two thousand, which is certainly better than initially announced. It's just that history depicts the rivalry between "Persians" and "Greeks" so peculiarly. But I've proven that the tale of Yeruslan Lazarevich is also a history of early Russia, copied from the history of the Khazar-Persian trade and robbery relations with the southern and trans-Ural tribes, which had no connection to Russia at the time.

The main point is that Jews were essentially rivals with Jews. And I want to dwell on this in more detail, only centuries later, but for now I'll focus on the so-called Renaissance, an intermediate stage.

"Greeks" versus "Greek" Cosimo de' Medici

In my aforementioned book, I examined Cosimo de' Medici and Florence in detail. Here I'll briefly discuss how "Greek thought" triumphed over the imperialistic aspirations of one "Greeks". I'm tired of repeating that Jews invented trade. And without trade, there's no life, no rich language, no writing, no sciences, and no arts. The Eastern tribe almost completely assimilated with the natives, taking over the ruling elite, while the Western tribe, in the form of the "Greeks", introduced the world to Greek philosophy, from which human rights arose. But one Jew didn't like this, and having amassed a fabulous fortune through indulgences, he decided to build a Christian empire in Western Europe and, if possible, throughout the rest of the world. This was Cosimo de' Medici.

To this end, he allegedly purchased all the manuscripts from the Turkish Muhammad II and founded a "Platonic" academy in Florence. But these books were simply rewritten by his henchmen Ficchino and Bracciolini and passed off as ancient Greek. They presented a Christian ideology based on Plato, the idealist, while Aristotle was ordered forgotten. And history was extended backwards, so that everything new seemed long since forgotten. The main component of this deception was the printing press, invented at the same time by Gutenberg, which replicated the deception many times over. For this purpose, he convened the so-called Ferrara-Florence Council, which did something completely different from what history records. Medici simply used money to subjugate the entire ecclesiastical elite at this seven-year council and turned them into commanders of the regular army of Christianity. And the first thing he did was launch a campaign against witches, or more precisely, against the deacon service that existed alongside the liturgical service.

Naturally, his successors, almost all popes, continued to establish Christianity as an imperialist religion, and were remarkably successful. Then, all the Jews, who appeared on the scene as "Greeks", or rather, as a "Greek heritage", rose up against the Medici and his descendants. This included Protestantism and Calvinism, which culminated in the Enlightenment. I have the details in my book and other works.

Generally speaking, Catholicism didn't last long in the original form the Medici clan gave it, but it left behind a wealth of memories and historical distortions. Printing is to blame, although the blame should lie with the people who owned the printing press. I mention this only because Western democracy rose on the shoulders of Catholicism, and it's impossible not to mention it.

"Bin Ladens" versus "Oppenheimers"

It's not East versus West that's competing today, nor Islam versus Christianity, nor Arabs versus Europeans. Jews will once again clash with Jews over their influence on Earth. Both the eastern and western tribes of Israel have become cramped on Earth.

The Jews who infiltrated the Eastern ruling elite and remained there for a long time initially focused heavily on the sciences, having been accustomed to working with both their heads and feet in previous centuries. But a life of idleness and comfort will make anyone lazy. After all, we've heard so much about Eastern "refined" idleness and pleasures. And I've already explained to the obtuse Frazer why it was the California Indians, living in the most favorable natural conditions, who found themselves at the lowest stage of development. But even the people who found themselves under the influence of Islam, where everything is predetermined and planned down to the last detail, and the reward for patience in life is in heaven, didn't try to outsmart their lazy rulers in adaptability. In short, it was a perfectly Russian thing: slow and steady wins the race, which is a shameless lie. And the Islamic countries fell asleep, barely waking to eat and reproduce. It's also long been known that the lower the literacy rate, the more children there are. The only consolation and entertainment, you know what? The rulers, including the Jews, were quite content with their harems and Eastern delicacies; the people provided them with both for now.

They only woke up twice. When Western engineers, like the late Paul Getty, discovered their vast oil deposits. And when Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill foolishly established a state for the Western tribe of Jews, who had never lived there, not even in the era before last.

When oil was discovered, they even initially opposed its development, since Allah had said nothing about it, and making the decision themselves was considered practically a revolution in the world. Then, when they finally decided to develop it, they didn't know what to do with the dollars that had fallen from the sky,

so they simply stuffed them in sacks and placed them in a corner of their palace. This went on for about thirty years. The Americans printed dollars and traded them for oil, and these dollars ended up forever in the sacks of Arab sheikhs. Sometimes the sheikhs would travel to Europe and America, taking two or three sacks of money for their daily expenses. And they spent them without counting. Only their children realized they had the sense to travel to the Old World to study, and once they'd graduated, they were in no hurry to return home: life in the West was so interesting and fulfilling. Some even went into business, and not without success; the good heredity, suppressed at home in the harems, began to speak. Some of the wealth even began to trickle down to the people. But this still seemed somewhat like charity or handouts, since it didn't inspire enthusiasm among the people to work and earn money, but rather to receive it simply for free, as they say, for nothing. It was a bit like Soviet socialism: the rulers got as much as they needed, the people got a little and equally.

Both the youth of the people and the ruling elite, having received little education and living abroad, quickly felt a certain disdain from the European public, driven by their archaic views on life, a fair amount of laziness, and stubbornness, fueled by petrodollars. And, in turn, they also grew angry at what they perceived as the arrogant Western Europeans. On this basis, a semblance of love arose between the Middle East and the socialist USSR, which, first and foremost, delighted the Soviet elite, who felt the same hidden disdain for themselves. In other words, the USSR began to exploit the East to spite the Americans and Europe. They went to Iran, we went to Iraq, they went to Turkey, we went to Egypt. It was interesting and fun, and you couldn't get bored.

But the common people, having learned about the delights of European life from the pioneers returning to their homeland, also flocked to Europe and America, in such a dense stream that the Western Europeans became somewhat uneasy. And it was precisely this mass movement that erected the invisible wall that began to grow like the Berlin Wall between East and West. Even the peace-loving John Kennedy, sensing this ticking mine beneath the world, tried to combine his and Soviet efforts to prevent the brewing global cataclysm, but it was no use. The Soviet elders, delighted by these circumstances, began to portray them as a global trend of "peoples' striving for socialism”, and continued to persist. And one part of the East received Soviet weapons for free, while the other part received American weapons for next to nothing. But I seem to be getting ahead of myself.

The second moment that awakened the Eastern rulers—for their common people couldn't care less—was the formation of the Jewish state, as I have already said. It was like a general meeting of your own building, without your consent, moving five homeless people from all over Moscow's train stations into your apartment because, you see, they had nowhere to live. And you see, your apartment has plenty of free space, not to mention the apartments next to yours. Would you be very happy? And why should the Eastern rulers be happy? Especially since the Western tribe of Israel sent so much money to this state—not its own, but collected from all Western budgets—that the Eastern rulers realized that money could be obtained not only for oil, but simply out of brotherly love. And this offended them even more.

Here's the main point. It turns out that all of Russia, although ostensibly a European power, has an Eastern, "cannibalistic" mentality, based on the First Law. Therefore, the West had no choice but to reduce Russia to a simple oil seller, like the Arab countries. As you can see, they've succeeded completely, no matter how much our rulers try to puff themselves up and deny this undeniable fact. Therefore, the current policy of our rulers is a real mess, one that even the mistress of the house doesn't fully understand. But for some reason, no one pays attention. I mean the media. Although, how can you pay attention? They're

quickly bent into a bow. And I won't dwell on this at length, not because I'm afraid, but because it's in plain sight, and everyone should have some understanding, rather than parroting words from the newspaper or on the screen. I'll simply list the countries with which we're swerving politically: Cuba, North Korea, Iraq, Iran, and so on. This policy looks especially ridiculous in connection with the "unconstitutional gangs in Chechnya", which we happily supported just recently across practically half the globe, and which we now want to officially "include" as "international terrorism", if possible. This used to be called standing with your legs spread apart, which, unfortunately, you can't stand for long. But I've gotten carried away again; after all, I'm talking about the eastern and western tribes of Israel.

Here we must again divide the problem into its components: on one side are the people, on the other are the rulers, both from the East and the West. Eastern rulers are very accustomed to the unconditional subordination of their people, even in their thoughts. And it is they who are the ones who are angry, but lack the technological means to arm their loyal subjects out of fear and persuasion. They have spent all scientific and technological progress in their harems. The people of this side don't care about anything, as long as they are left alone, but if given weapons, they will go to war, and they will fight desperately. And if their rulers don't have weapons, then they are forced to send their people on suicide missions: you die alone and take a bunch of "enemies" with you. And whatever one may say, this is a terrible force. And there is virtually no antidote for it, even if all the "enemies" are "Pinkertons". Then, again, there will be no one to drive progress, because the Pinkertons, as we know, don't.

I move on to the Western tribe. Western rulers are simply responding to the challenge from the East, trying to ignore the fact that they themselves, albeit with the best of intentions, initiated this process. A systemic error has simply crept into the reasoning of fifty years ago. This is oil for paper, and the creation of Israel where it shouldn't exist. For the Jews completely voluntarily abandoned their lands at the dawn of humanity, and only complete fools among them fail to understand this, or have simply forgotten. But Western Jews are justified at least by the fact that they did not introduce the First Law into the peoples they combed, which allowed jurisprudence and human rights to flourish. That the Jews quietly rule the West, I hope you have no doubt. Just as their Eastern tribe rules the East.

Western people don't care about this either, but they are very afraid of terrorism. Therefore, they vote with both hands for harsh measures against it. But since the people as a whole are very intelligent, while individually they consist of near-idiots, they don't realize that harsh measures are futile. And to be elected, rulers need to pander to the "aspirations" of their people. So they bomb, knowing full well that it's futile. And the situation escalates.

There is only one conclusion to draw from this situation: Jews as a whole are getting stupider, even though they live better than all other peoples. Or rather, they are getting stupider because they have begun to live better than everyone else. Today, they remind me of the Californian Indians I mentioned above. Individual adaptability to life still remains, but strategic national thinking has been lost, in my opinion, forever. Eastern Jews, as you yourself have seen, began to get stupid much earlier.

And if that's the case, then they might as well learn a lesson. They must understand that the "entire West"'s war against Bin Laden is a war between the Western and Eastern tribes of Israel. Individual warfare among Jews has been a timeless practice; it's the foundation of their Deuteronomy, which unites Jews only in their love for Yahweh, while relegating their disputes to the courts. Therefore, while they may have been

somewhat warring individuals, they were, as a whole, a monolith. Until the ties between the Western and Eastern tribes were severed, these tribes developed along different paths.

And if Jews understand this, there will be a glimmer of hope. The ancient Persian god Mithra was simply called "The Covenant". Let Bin Laden take note of this. Incidentally, his father was born in Yemen, so he is a pure Jew, not even "tainted" by ancient Persian blood. And let "the entire West" understand a simple truth known to every Jew. But for that, I need to digress.

I'll start, as always, with the Russians, because I know them better. How do we do things here? If, for example, you accidentally plant your garden bed on your neighbor's property in a dacha cooperative, you are enemies forever, since ordinary apologies in such cases are ineffective, as they are perceived by the other side as weakness. And weakness demands an offensive. The apologizing side turns purple and retracts their apology. Thus the conflict escalates ad infinitum. With Jews, however, in private interactions, it's the opposite. They'll simply submit to the court and continue greeting each other as before. Moreover, in one case they're enemies, in the other they're two comrades – inseparable. That is, the relationship in this particular case doesn't affect the relationship in general. This is particularly evident in Berezovsky and Gusinsky. Personal relationships between Jews can shift from hostility to friendship at will. And that's good. But for us, it's bad. You can't narrow your circle of friends so much over trifles.

This Jewish truth of private Jewish communication simply needs to be extended to clan relationships. Or haven't you yet recognized yourselves in "Bin Laden" and "the entire West"? Then at least find out from me. But for some reason these two clans are acting completely in the Russian way. And that's not allowed, you know that. First, each of you, in your own privacy, admit that there was a mistake with Israel. Any mistake, except for the mine clearing, can and should be corrected. But primacy must come from "the entire West", since it is stronger and can simply incinerate the other side. And what is "the entire West" doing? It is developing a doctrine of a first-priority nuclear strike and asking Russia to "understand" it. What fool would "understand" that? That's why I say that the Western race is deteriorating before our very eyes. Not in its face, of course, but in its mind. Although it does reflect on its face.

I will not consider possible options for "mutual understanding". My task is to target. And the trends will be encouraging.

March 27, 2002

Although, after thinking about it, I will say a few words. Firstly, international Jewry has no right to create the state of Israel. But it has been created. Therefore, this international mistake must be corrected. Perhaps even the creation, under UN auspices, of a Jewish-Islamic-Christian district in the Jerusalem area, governed by a Jewish-Islamic-Christian council. Let them fight in this council, not on the streets of Palestinian-Israeli cities. Secondly, on the ambitious issue between Al-Qaeda and "the entire Jewish West", negotiations must be held, without much publicity for now. Posters can be put up when there is progress in these negotiations. Thirdly, this cannibalistic rule must be destroyed by all available means, and America must help in this. But with one caveat. The most important priority, after the rights of the individual, must be the recognition of the right of a nation to self-determination, even if it consists of just a single village. But America is not yet ready for this, nor is England, let alone Russia. So, for now, there is a dead end. And until this dead end is overcome, it is too early to talk about world peace.

Having written these words, I decided to continue a topic that seemed almost finished. Here's the thing. Everyone knows the state of San Marino, nestled in the middle of Italy like a pole in a field. Although it is, in fact, a small mountain on a completely flat surface, and on top of that mountain is a state. And it has been an independent state for a very long time, because it has always fiercely defended its sovereignty, and the mountain was a great aid in this. So much so that even Napoleon, upon learning its history, did not conquer it along with Italy itself, leaving everything as it was. There are only a few such states on Earth, although there could be thousands of times more. I didn't misspeak—thousands of times more. For example, in Russia alone, it is believed that about two hundred peoples inhabit it, while in reality, in the Kemerovo region alone, I know of several "uncounted" peoples, almost extinct from Russian vodka. What can we say then about the entire Earth?

I've said more than once in my works that Africa before World War II was painted in only three colors, and today cartographers don't have enough colors for it. So many new states have formed there. But the wars in Africa don't stop. And the newspapers tell us that emperors there are all dividing up power. I don't think that's true. It's just that one emperor wants, for example, to trade with one transnational corporation, and another with another similar corporation. And that's precisely why there are wars there. And the corporations buy them rifles. Corporations benefit from large areas for trade, because when they are divided into smaller areas, in each of those areas they will have to fight a war for their rights to trade there. And do you know how expensive that is? And tedious. And you can get confused in such wars, sending the wrong people to kill. This is one of the reasons why in the modern world no one has yet figured out the right of nations to self-determination. Or rather, they did figure it out, but they blocked it with another process – the inviolability of internal state borders. As if someone on the outside benefits from these borders not collapsing.

Although, on the other hand, small empires that can be dealt with are still being destroyed, like Yugoslavia, for example. But that's at the level of governments, not trade and industrial corporations. And I wholeheartedly welcome this process. But the African process – no; let them shrink, after all, they're still empires, not mono-ethnic states. Besides, no one asks the people themselves; they negotiate with their emperors. But we should be asking the people, too.

Take the Kurds, for example. They're a people too. Why are they denied the right to self-determination? And the people of Northern Ireland, who are presented with the right to self-determination as a confrontation between "Protestant ultras" and "Catholics", when the issue is in England itself. And the people of Chechnya. The newspapers tell us that a "double standard" applies here, without explaining what it actually is. Incidentally, this rule also applies between the "Eastern" and "Western" tribes of Israel. So I'll elaborate.

In reality, a double standard can only be applied for one reason: is it profitable for me or not? For example, it's profitable for me to sell rotten meat, so I sell it according to a standard that allows it. It's unprofitable for me to eat rotten meat, so I buy it according to a standard that doesn't allow rotten meat to be sold. That's all there is to it. And nothing would be easier than inventing a single standard for the entire world. But that's impossible yet. Just like everyone falling in love with the same woman, even a movie star. So the problem is insoluble? Oh, come on, it's perfectly solvable. When you get married, what's the universal rule? Things will get better, that's the rule, and unfortunately, we all obey it 90 percent of the time. Think of your family and friends, and you'll see that 90 percent of this isn't just a fantasy, but something I learned from real life.

But not every law is universally liked, especially by thieves, bandits, and simple child molesters, not to mention tax evaders. So the "well-wishes-be-well" formula is a universal one. And a very necessary one, since there's no alternative. Why then are there double standards not only for meat but also for national self-determination? Well, we already know one reason: corporate interests. How, for example, will England fight so hard for the freedom of Chechnya when Margaret Thatcher herself, just 10 years ago, sacrificed so many lives and her country's treasure for the Falklands, which are not her ancestral property? Then should Northern Ireland be handed over to the Irish? Why on earth would that be?

But there's another aspect. Experience shows that people cannot free themselves from cannibalistic rule, especially in such large empires as Russia or China. And England itself, not so long ago. From within, such empires never transition to democracy. At least, not a single one has yet. And I tirelessly raise this theme in almost all my works. This can only be accomplished from the outside. And there are countless examples: Japan, South Korea, Italy, and even Germany itself, not to mention all those small Pacific islands. But these are either small countries that a country like the United States could defeat without great harm, or rather large countries that lack the atomic bomb and other terrifying military devices like the sunken Kursk. That's precisely why England is still fighting for the freedom of Chechnya, but under the guise of defending "human rights" there, as if unaware that in Russia not only are human rights themselves not properly protected, but the average person can't even get them on paper in a bookstore.

There's a third aspect. It's not just the soldier in the famous film who knows that "the East is a delicate matter"—everyone knows it. The East is almost entirely under the control of a cannibalistic government. So it needs to be dismembered, but that's difficult because of this very cannibalistic rule; it brings these countries very close together and, in a way, unites them. I think that's why Iran is so vacillating in American preferences. The same goes for the Kurds' rights to self-determination; they're of lesser importance now, when Turkey, a formidable country, has somewhat retreated from its imperial-military stance, focusing on improving its economy. A good economy is more likely to attract democracy than a bad one, let alone a military one. In other words, the West is subtly forcing the East to split, first through a coordinated policy, and then—we'll see. And that's precisely why the Americans came to Afghanistan, not for bin Laden. And they're subtly taking over our former Central Asia, and Georgia, and even Ukraine. Why do you think such a scandal has erupted over our presence in Iran's nuclear arsenal? So that Iran wouldn't so much develop its own atomic bomb as stop greeting Russia altogether. And if we hadn't promised Iran our atomic secrets, it would have done just that. Because it's still afraid of Saddam Hussein. And that's precisely why the Americans promise to bomb him and free Iran from this fear, and consequently, from the desire for an atomic bomb.

I was about to move on to the "bipolar" and "unipolar" worlds, but I remembered that I should also say a few words about Yugoslavia. It was a pure experiment, and that's precisely why it couldn't be done without a certain ambiguity of standard. The experiment consisted of gaining experience in dividing empires, just as genetic engineering is studied not on humans, but on fruit flies. It's cheaper, both morally and financially. And there was a need to rush this experiment, and who cares about flies? Well, it's also a new undertaking, so to speak, and yet you can't plan it out in advance. Experiments always misfire. And if you blame the Americans, then you also have to blame those who don't launch satellites into orbit right away, or who burn the cosmonauts on board. But I haven't heard anything about that. I haven't even heard about the trial of the Totsky test site experimenters, or the Chernobyl cleanup crews who murdered thousands of ignorant soldiers there, carrying buckets of uranium and irradiated graphite. But in each of these cases, there's a

justification, and even the soldiers carrying buckets of uranium and graphite essentially saved us all from the even more dire consequences of the reactor accident. They should have all been named, given medals and at least a State Duma pension, not sent to die in their villages without a penny in their pockets. Incidentally, life will improve in the countries of the former Yugoslavia, and there will be more democracy, but the ambitions of their rulers will be disproportionately less. Did they pay dearly? No more than the liquidators of the aforementioned accident and the test subjects of Totskoye and other nuclear test sites.

I'll begin my discussion of the bipolar and unipolar worlds with a simple example: a husband, wife, mother-in-law, and other relatives. I specifically chose this multipolar family world to demonstrate that it fully aligns with the United Nations. In a family, by and large, one person is always in charge: the husband, wife, mother-in-law, or even a cousin. Not without scandals, of course, but as soon as scandals exceed the acceptable level determined by practice, the family ceases to exist. Therefore, the politicians' and newspaper hacks' fiction about a "multipolar world”, in which each pole represents something of equal value, is worthless. Especially since every single one of them preaches that the family is the "basic unit of society”.

Let's move on to a bipolar world, which, for example, is represented by the line from the song: "You and I are two banks of the same river”, that is, the world of husband and wife. In such a "social unit”, either the husband beats his wife to death, or the wife keeps him under her thumb, and there are five thousand variations of these extreme situations. And if the family still survives, it means it suits both components of this "unit”. I don't even want to consider the reasons, since they concern no one but these two. I will simply note that if a husband and wife never quarrel, then this is a unipolar world. These are two banks of the same river, and both are right. Even if the husband feels perfectly fine under his wife's thumb, or the wife, beaten all night, can't tear herself away from her husband in the morning to finally see him off to work. But this rarely happens. More often, the "pole"—but note, one, not two—moves from one individual to the other. So, after all, this is a unipolar world. And even the Earth always has one pole: north, south, magnetic, cold, heat, depth, altitude, and so on. Another thing is that some two poles are symmetrical, like a magnetic needle, but N and S are still different things. Some fluids exit one pole, while, conversely, they enter the other.

And the burning desire of one of the symmetrical "poles" to assume a dominant role is unrealistic. They can only coexist together, and only as equals. It's like a husband and wife never arguing. But that's only a very rare, isolated case, and it can't be expected of all married couples. Why then do our politicians demand a bipolar world? And are so angry that it's becoming increasingly unipolar. They'd be better off being angry at Mount Everest, because it's the only one on Earth that has such a thing. And on the opposite hemisphere, there's a complete pit in that spot. What am I getting at? The moment you hear about the demand for a "bipolar world”, you, like me, should feel nauseous.

So, in the vast majority of cases, the world is unipolar. And this, strange as it may seem at first glance, is good, even excellent. Because there are fewer conflicts in a unipolar world. But certain people don't like it simply because they make little money from it. So they try to create another pole, attract more supporters, and, using this increased strength, seize power, and with it, money, from the previously incumbent pole. That's all. And we are fooled by an ideology that, supposedly, the new pole is better. And we run after them headlong, without delving into the essence of the matter. And we destroy everything in sight. And when the new pole seizes power and money from the old pole, we begin to realize that for us, the game wasn't worth the candle.

But most people won't understand all this anytime soon, if they ever do. Communists fight liberals, Islamists fight Christians, Soviet imperialists fight capitalist imperialists, greens fight blues, reds fight greens, and whites fight blacks. And all this is for power, from which they can draw money. That's why Jews are always ahead in this struggle. Moreover, they fight on both sides, developing ideologies and therefore serving as leaders of one pole or the other. True, they are often shady, gray ones, for they want to rake in the cash with others' hands due to their natural "modesty", which gives them an inordinate pleasure in power. Such a person, seeing some president in an ermine robe being indulged by the stupid elite, thinks: I'll just snap my fingernail at your idol like a louse or a cockroach, and laugh at you for being stupid and suddenly confused. It's nice, isn't it?

So, having looked at a simplified picture of cannibalistic and normal governance of the people, I immediately complicated it to the point of impossibility. Everything in the world is complicated, after all. It's just chopping wood.